

THE CONFESSIONS OF AN ANTI-SEMITITE



The First-Ever
Critical Analysis
of the Linguistic
Legerdemain
Underlying the
Propaganda
Techniques of the
New World Order

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

THE CONFESSIONS of an ANTI-SEMITES

This is a very skilled man. In all my years of fighting anti-Semitism I've never heard so many classic anti-Semitic canards incorporated into one articulate, grammatically correct sentence.

—Hyman Bookbinder, longtime Washington representative of the American Jewish Committee, responding to a call-in question by Michael Collins Piper when Bookbinder was a guest on the Fred Fiske radio program on WAMU FM in Washington, DC (Circa 1985)

WASH DC
2/12/12

Thanks for all
your good
support!

Michael Collins Piper

Confessions of an Anti-Semite © 2011 by Michael Collins Piper

First U.S. Printing:

Available from: *American Free Press*
645 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20003
1-888-699-6397
www.americanfreepress.net

Order extra copies of this book from *American Free Press* at \$25 per copy

To contact the author:

Michael Collins Piper
PO Box 15728
Washington, DC 20003
Email: michaelcollinspiper@yahoo.com
Tel: (202) 544-5977
See his website at michaelcollinspiper.com
Hear his broadcast at michaelcollinspiper.podbean.com

THE TEMPTATION is to extend a variety of kudos and acknowledgements to numbers of people who have crossed my paths in the course of my career and contributed to my work, including a few who have become very good friends. And I've also accumulated some remarkable enemies who have, in their own way, also contributed to my efforts. I have already saluted many of those people in my previous published works.

However, above all, it is beyond any question that Willis A. Carto (and his wife Elisabeth) who have been first and foremost responsible for making it possible to do what I have done in the literary and broadcasting fields and to see the things I have seen and meet the people all over the world that I have encountered in the course of my adventures. So therefore, most appropriately, most simply and most especially I thank them for all of that and much more.

At the suggestion of my Malaysian friend, Matthias Chang, I had the great pleasure of preparing an assembly of Willis' pivotal writings published under the title *An Appeal to Reason*. The book also contains what I think is a quite interesting and candid personal assessment of Willis from my own perspective (And, by the way, I did not let him read that profile before publication).

I strongly encourage any and all to take a look at the book. You're guaranteed to learn a lot, since it reflects much knowledge and insights gleaned over Willis's long career in the public arena.

The book, incidentally, was titled as it was as a tribute to Willis's old friend, the late Lawrence Dennis, one of my very favorite writers and also perhaps the foremost nationalist theoretician of the 20th Century. It was the title of Dennis' own newsletter that inspired the title for the collection of Willis's writings.

Even if it were not for all of what Willis has done otherwise to advance my career, I'd still be indebted to him immensely, if only for the simple reason that Willis recently gave me as a much-appreciated gift his entire valuable set of Dennis' historic and very hard-to-find newsletter, a real treasure!

THE CONFESSIONS of an ANTI-SEMITES

The First-Ever Critical Analysis
of the Linguistic Legerdemain
Underlying the Propaganda
Techniques of the New World Order

By MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

SEWARD SQUARE
Washington, D.C.



God's special creatures . . . A gallery of some of Michael Collins Piper's best friends over the years. Clockwise: the inimitable roly-poly Big Cat; the magnificent Baron; Sweet, stout Miss Marcy; my mother's beloved Wolfgang (and me); the one and only Mr. Parsche; Blackie—who ran away—shaking hands with his little brother (me); and (top left), the gentle, loving Bandit. All very nice friends who are most fondly remembered.

DEDICATION

To the Helpless Four-Legged Creatures of God Mercilessly Slaughtered by the Israeli Military at the Little Neighborhood Zoo in Gaza

Nobody seemed to care about the 1,400 Christian and Muslim men, women and children killed by Israel during the invasion and siege of Gaza beginning at the end of 2009—but maybe some people will care about the innocent caged animals slaughtered by Israeli soldiers at the little zoo in Gaza.

It's a fact: Israeli soldiers rampaged through the tiny zoo and shot as many innocent animals at point blank range as they could.

Although it should have been a worldwide scandal—on the front page of every daily paper and on every nightly broadcast on television and radio—it was not.

While some defenders of Israel attempted to suggest that the zoo and its animals were unintended "collateral damage" of war-time, caught in military cross-fire, the evidence demonstrates otherwise.

The soldiers of "America's dearest ally" went into the zoo itself and shot the poor monkeys in their cages. A mother monkey tried to hide with her baby in a clay pot, but the Israelis shot the pot to pieces and killed them.

Although the soldiers of "the apple of God's eye" fired on the two lions, those wily four-legged cats managed to escape from their lair and hid in one of the zoo offices.

And while the Israelis did not shoot the foxes, those little fellows turned on each other for food when the zookeepers were not able (due to the military action in Gaza) to get there in time to feed them. The hysterical foxes mauled each other to death in a frenzied act of cannibalism.

A pregnant camel died after a missile cut her down, tearing a foot-long hole in the side of the fabled "horse of the desert." A pathetic picture of the camel, which clearly took some time to die—very much in agony—was released to the world by the zoo authorities, but few people anywhere saw the ugly image.

While Israel has grandly asserted its military is the "most moral" armed force of any nation on the planet, the real nature of Israel was bared to the world—although not to the extent that it should be—when the truth about the Israeli army's violent and malicious attack on the animals in the Gaza Zoo came to the fore.

The horrible story was told in the January 25, 2010 issue of *Gulf News*, published in Abu Dhabi, and was repeated on websites on the Internet, but a check of the vaunted "news" source of Google, the

Internet giant (owned by two billionaires who are supporters of Israel) indicates that the story has never appeared in any newspaper or magazine catalogued by Google.

But the "moral" Israelis weren't content with butchering the animals. They even defaced the walls of the main building and ripped out one of the toilets.

When the zookeeper was asked why the Israelis targeted the zoo, he laughed in irony and said, "I don't know. You have to go and ask the Israelis. This is a place where people come to enjoy themselves. It's not a place of politics."

Responding to claims by Israel that Palestinians were firing rockets from civilian areas (including the zoo) the zookeeper said: "There was not a single person in this zoo. Just the animals. We all fled before they came. What purpose does it serve to walk around shooting animals and destroying the place?"

During the previous four years, the zoo was the most popular place in Gaza for the Christian and Muslim children of Gaza. There was nowhere else for people to go. The Israelis destroyed the zoo and God's dear innocent four-legged creatures therein.

And may God damn them for it!

To the Israelis—and all who would try to defend or explain away this crime—I have but one simple comment: "Incidents such as this *are* the cause of anti-Semitism" and that's why—like the bold Arab warrior—a genuine Semite—honored on this book's cover—we're ready to fight them to the finish. And *we* are going to win . . .

And a very special dedication . . .

TO PHILLIP F. TOURNEY

No matter how much I have written in this book—or in any of my many others—there's no way that I can convey the reality of what faces our world today as well as Phil Tournay has done in his book, *What I Saw That Day*, his personal account of the horrific attack by Israel on Phil and his mates aboard the *U.S.S. Liberty* on June 8, 1967.

Phil and the men of the *Liberty*—those who lived and those who died—saw the face of the Devil that day.

A good and decent man—a genuine hero—Phil is a statesman in the classic sense and much deserving—along with the men of the *Liberty*—of far more tribute than these simple words here.


I am honored to call Phil my friend.

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

Meet Some Famous Anti-Semites . . .

Here is a list of notable people (past and present) accused of being "anti-Semitic" or insufficiently supportive of Israel. This is just a handful! See the appendix for an even more extraordinary list. But please be warned: If you admire any of those individuals listed, you might be accused of "admiring an anti-Semite."

- President Richard Nixon
- President Jimmy Carter
- President Gerald Ford
- Sen. Robert F. Kennedy (D-N.Y.)
- Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.)
- Sen. Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill.)
- Sen. Mike Gravel (D-Alaska.)
- Rep. Paul Findley (R-Ill.)
- Rep. Ed Zschau (R-Calif.)
- Rep. Mervyn Dymally (D-Calif.)
- Rep. John R. Rarick (D-La.)
- Rep. Jim Traficant (D-Ohio)
- UN Ambassador Bill Scranton
- Gov. John Connally (D-Texas)
- Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger
- General George Patton
- General George Stratemeyer
- Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh
- General George V. Strong (Chief of Military Intelligence - 1942-45)
- Major General George Van Horn Moseley (U.S. Army Asst Chief of Staff)
- Colonel Sherman Miles (Chief of Military Intelligence)
- General George Brown (Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff)
- Admiral Thomas Moorer (Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff)
- Gen. Pedro Del Valle (U.S. Marines) • W.A. Carto • Dr. Mahathir Mohamad
- Walt Disney • Thomas Edison • Henry Ford • Carl Jung • Truman Capote
- H. L. Mencken • Theodore Dreiser • Lord Byron • Nathaniel Hawthorne
- Ernest Hemingway • Thomas Carlyle • Henry James • F. Scott Fitzgerald
- Henry Adams • T. S. Eliot • George Eliot • Washington Irving • Jack Kerouac
- Gore Vidal • Percy Shelley • Rudyard Kipling • C. Northcote Parkinson
- H. G. Wells • D. H. Lawrence • Franz Liszt • James Russell Lowell
- Somerset Maugham • Henry Miller • Eugene O'Neill • Sir Walter Scott
- Ezra Pound • George Sand • George Bernard Shaw • Johannes Brahms
- Richard Wagner • William Faulkner • Robert Louis Stevenson • George Orwell
- President John F. Kennedy
- President George H.W. Bush
- President Harry Truman
- Sen. William Fulbright (D-Ark.)
- Sen. Jim Abourezk (D-S.D.)
- Sen. Ernest F. Hollings (D-S.C.)
- Rep. Cynthia McKinney (D-Ga.)
- Rep. Pete McCloskey (R-Calif.)
- Rep. Mary Rose Oakar (D-Ohio)
- Rep. Gus Savage (D-Ill.)
- Rep. Steve Stockman (R-Texas)
- Rep. Earl Hilliard (D-Ala.)
- UN Ambassador Andrew Young
- Defense Secretary James Forrestal
- Secretary of State James Baker
- General George C. Marshall
- General Albert Wedemeyer
- General Robert Wood



Goyim [non-Jews] were born only to serve us. Without that, they have no place in the world; only to serve the People of Israel. Why are gentiles needed? They will work, they will plow, they will reap. We will sit like an effendi [a lord and master] and eat.

—Rabbi Ovadia Yosef

Former Chief Sephardic Rabbi of Israel and
spiritual leader of Israel's Shas Party

Jewish Telegraph Agency report: Oct. 18, 2010

I don't believe in western morality, i.e. don't kill civilians or children, don't destroy holy sites, don't fight during holiday seasons, don't bomb cemeteries, don't shoot until they shoot first because it is immoral. The only way to fight a moral war is the Jewish way: Destroy their holy sites. Kill men, women and children (and cattle).

—Rabbi Manis Friedman

Bais Chana Institute of Jewish Studies
St. Paul, Minnesota

Writing in *Moment* magazine,
May/June 2009

So sayeth the spiritual leaders of the Jewish people . . .

A Note From the Author . . .

I've stared terrorism in the face. It's chilling. Not many Americans have had that experience. You have no idea what it's like to be surrounded by armed police officers protecting you from known terrorists who are out to get you just because you said something critical about a foreign nation—in this case, Israel. That's what happened to me in 1998 at Saddleback College in Orange County, California.

Following the announcement I had been invited to lecture at the college—discussing my book, *Final Judgment*, which contends Israeli intelligence played a role in the JFK assassination (as a consequence of JFK's effort to prevent Israel from acquiring nuclear weapons)—the nation's foremost Jewish organization, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, instigated a major public uproar, pressuring the college to cancel my lecture.

Nonetheless, I still traveled to Orange County to speak publicly to the college board of trustees, standing up to the ADL's intellectual terrorism, its ruthless, un-American efforts (while masquerading as a "civil rights group") to suppress my First Amendment right to free expression.

It was then that Irv Rubin, the leader of the violent terrorist Jewish Defense League (JDL), jumped into action. Rubin showed up at the college and publicly threatened my life.

Learning Rubin was going to be on the scene, the police stood ready. They took Rubin seriously, knowing the JDL had a long history of violence—including murder—to the point the FBI had ranked the JDL as one of the foremost terrorist groups then operating on American soil. And it's no surprise that in 2001 Rubin was arrested for planning to bomb a mosque and the office of a U.S. congressman, after which Rubin died—ostensibly a suicide—in prison.

Although, over the years, the ADL publicly denounced Rubin's violence, maverick Jewish journalist Robert I. Friedman revealed that the JDL was directed by Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad, and that the JDL was funded by respected American Jews who also financed the ADL. In short, the JDL was doing the ADL's street-level "dirty work."

So all the while that public spokesman for the ADL—typically a wise and friendly old rabbi—a Holocaust survivor—was in his den studying the Torah and publicly preaching "brotherhood," the ADL's hired thug, Irv Rubin, was down the street planting bombs and committing murder.


In fact, the ugly Neanderthal visage of Irv Rubin reflected the true face of the ADL and the forces behind it: the wealthy and influential Jewish elite, the satellites of the global Rothschild dynasty which is itself the driving force behind what is called "The New World Order."

I was targeted because these forces decided that I was an "anti-Semite." Perhaps now you'll understand why I've written this book. And maybe you'll join me in the fight against the worst terrorists of all.

For over 30 years Michael Collins Piper has been fighting against needless wars and global imperialism. He's traveled 'round the world telling good people all over the planet that *real* Americans do not support the criminal actions of the Zionist elite who reign supreme on American soil . . .



Above, left, Michael Collins Piper shares a light moment in Kuala Lumpur with longtime former Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Mohamad. Right, Piper—a renowned animal lover—visits the memorial, at Tokyo's famed Yasukuni Shrine, to the dogs who served alongside Japanese troops in wartime. Below, right, with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Below, left, Piper lectures before the Arab League think tank, the Zayed International Center for Coordination and Follow-Up, in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates.



Below, left, at Red Square in Moscow. Center, Piper smiles for the camera with Dr. Sanusi Junid, president of the International Islamic University in Malaysia (left), and Count Hans Christophe Von Sponeck (right), former Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations and coordinator of the UN's humanitarian program in Iraq prior to the American invasion. At right, conducting his radio forum on the Internet at michaelcollinspiper.podbean.com.



WHAT THIS BOOK IS ABOUT . . .

Challenging an Ugly History of Lies, Bullying and Double Standards:

Over the last decade I have had the great privilege of having traveled all over the world to meet and speak with vast numbers of people in both public and private forums discussing the very issues addressed in this volume. I have been to Moscow, Russia, to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, to Tokyo, Japan, to Tehran, Iran, to Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates, and all across Canada.

During those travels I have met some of the richest people on the planet and some of the poorest people as well. I have met world leaders and distinguished industrialists and financiers and diplomats and academics—not to mention “regular” folks from all walks of life.

And if there is one thing I can say with unqualified certainty, it is this: “they” do not “hate us,” as the Jewish propagandists in the media are forever proclaiming. Rather, if I heard it said once, I heard it said a hundred times: “We don’t hate America. We don’t hate the American people. What we do hate is the way the Jewish agenda is being carried out through the American government to wage war all over the planet. We hope the American people will stand up and fight and take back their country before the world is destroyed.”

It is as simple as that.

And that’s why I have chosen to do my damndest to work against these forces that have brought my country to where it is today. They call me an “anti-Semite” and all manner of defamatory names, but I will not let them silence me. To Hell with them.

While my critics proclaim themselves the Chosen People of God and declare themselves the ultimate inheritors of the world—the rest of humanity, the “Goyim” be damned—I can only but recall the words of Joe Biden (now vice president of the United States) at the Democratic National Convention in 2008, paying tribute to his mother. He said:

My mother’s creed is the American creed. No one is better than you. Everyone is your equal, and everyone is equal to you. . . .

When I got knocked down by guys bigger than me, and this is the God’s truth, she sent me back out the street and told me, “Bloody their nose so you can walk down the street the next day.” And that’s what I did.”

And that is precisely my thinking. And that is my intention. I’m tired of the lies and the bullying and the double standards that are the foundation upon which the monstrous misconduct of U.S. foreign policy

now stands—the direct consequence of inordinate (extraordinary) Jewish financial (and thus political) power in America today, a level of influence made more ultimately substantial due to the massive Jewish control of the mass media, a fact that only liars or fools would deny.

This provocatively titled work that I now present for inspection is primarily a broad-ranging reflection upon my quite diverse (and, I think, often interesting) personal experiences in journalism and broadcasting that have brought me to this point in my life where I have been formally reckoned to be an “anti-Semite” (whether that label is accurate or not). But the book is much more than that.

Part memoir, part polemic, part pedantry—a no-holds-barred effort to examine in honest terms one of the most written-about subjects in all of history, an endeavor to explore this thing called “Anti-Semitism,” we will seek to determine if what is described as “Anti-Semitism” is just that or whether it is something quite the opposite: a defensive reaction against Jewish attitudes (and, dare I say, “intrigues”) that play such a major role in America (and the world) in this, the 21st Century.

I make no apologies—none at all—for the tough talk or the candor to be found in these pages. If you are easily distressed by frank opinions, undisguised and by no means cast in terms of political correctness, I ask you—no, I beg you—to read no further.

Many people advised me that I should not write about my own life experiences—that it was “too personal”—but, as the old saying goes, “Names Make the News.” You see, while I have not only spent the entirety of my professional career reporting the news, I have—to a certain degree (as you’ll see)—also been “in” the news myself, as a direct consequence of my career-long link to the Problem of anti-Semitism.

This is a deadly serious topic, and I do not use the term “deadly” lightly for we are talking here about the survival of mankind.

I salute “those foreigners”—Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, members of obscure tribes and religious sects all over the world whose names I do not even know—who stand with the American people and pray that more and more Americans—in the days ahead—will come to realize that there is a genuine need for global unity.

It is time for hands across the water, to bring about the very real “change” (to use a popular refrain of the day) that will put an end to the policies that are strangling America and threatening to destroy our world. In the end, I’m confident, we will prevail.

We don’t need more war. We don’t need more imperialism. We don’t need a New World Order—at least not the kind that the internationalist plutocrats desire. With this book I hope in some small way to help avert these ever-present dangers . . . before it’s too late.

THE CONFESSIONS of an ANTI-SEMITES

In *The Confessions of an Anti-Semite*, my colleague, Michael Collins Piper, has written a book straight from his heart. In doing so, he has expressed opinions of millions not so courageous as he.

I welcome this pivotal work in which Mike courageously explores the major existential problem of our time, the negative influence that a highly-organized minority—an historically alien influence—has on America’s and, in fact, the entire Western world’s policies and indeed the destiny of our people.

Warmly endorsing this book, I commend it to the attention of my fellow Americans and to all peoples who share a stake in the survival of humankind.

—WILLIS A. CARTO



Idetest [the Jews] and everything connected with them, and I live only and solely with the hope of seeing their demise, with all their accursed Judaism. I want to see all the lenders at interest taken out and executed. I am myself more than ever at odds with my time. I detest it and everything that belongs to it, and live only in the wish to see the end of it, with all its infernal Jewry.

—Henry Adams

Rome was a blessed garden of paradise beside the rotten, rswindling, lying Jews, represented by . . . the gang that have been manipulating the country for the last few years.

—Brooks Adams

And when the Jews have got absolute control of finance, the Army and navy, the press, diplomacy, society, titles, the government, and the earth's surface, what do you suppose they will do with them and with us? That question will eventually drive me mad.

—James Russell Lowell

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface:

The Linguistic and Rhetorical Propaganda Foundation
of the Drive for the New World Order.....23

Foreword:

But What About the Holocaust?
Some People Forget that War is Hell..... 29

Introduction:

Yes, You, Too, Are an Anti-Semite.....45

Chapter One:

If "They" Say I'm an *Anti-Semite, Well, It Must be True.....55

Chapter Two:

Not Just Bigots, Cranks, and Criminal Hoodlums:
What is This Thing Called "Anti-Semitism"?.....65

Chapter Three:

Are the Jews a Superior Race—as They Claim?.....89

Chapter Four:

The Jews and the Blacks and Martin Luther King.....105

Chapter Five:

Are the Jews Really "Jews"?.....121

Chapter Six:

Judaism as a Political Force:
No Religion is Exempt From Scrutiny137

Chapter Seven:

Jewish Misuse of Wealth and Power
A Political Issue That Must Be Addressed.....151

Chapter Eight:

How I Discovered the Problem of Anti-Semitism.....169

Chapter Nine:

Confronting the Secret (and Not-So-Secret) History
of the Jewish Role in American and World Affairs.....193

Chapter Ten:

An Urgent Plea to the Jewish People
to Join the Community of Mankind.....201

Chapter Eleven:JFK, 9-11, and the *U.S.S. Liberty*:

The Impact of the Jewish Problem on Our World Today.....205

Chapter Twelve:

Non-Sensical Efforts to Excuse Israeli Crimes

and the Intrigues of the Jewish Lobby in America..... 209

Chapter Thirteen:

Confronting Big Shot Politicians in Washington

Over the Issue of Israeli Crimes and Jewish Intrigues.....211

Chapter Fourteen:

What One of the World's Richest, Most Powerful People

Told Me About the Reality of Jewish Power.....217

Chapter Fifteen:

Even Bill and Hillary Dare to Speak Out221

Chapter Sixteen:

An "American Nationalist Anti-Semite"

Gets a "Big Hello" in Moscow.....223

Chapter Seventeen:

My First Visit to the Arab World.....227

Chapter Eighteen:

Zionist Influence on the American Media.....237

Chapter Nineteen:

Zionist Pressure Results in Shut-Down

of the Arab League Think Tank.....258

Chapter Twenty:

Simon Wiesenthal's Henchman: A Hookworm from Hell.....261

Chapter Twenty-One:

Reaching Out to the Muslim World

in the Face of Jewish Global Intrigue.....269

Chapter Twenty-Two:

A Corrupt U.S. Ambassador's Criminal Conspiracy

Against Michael Collins Piper.....273

Chapter Twenty-Three:

What Really Happened: The Holocaust Conference in Iran.....279

Chapter Twenty-Four:

Another Holocaust Adventure:

Saying "Boo" to Deborah "Lippy" Lipstadt.....294

Chapter Twenty-Five:

Ezra Pound: Another of the Great "Anti-Semites".....299

Chapter Twenty-Six:

Israel: The Failed State.....315

Chapter Twenty-Seven:

Birobidjan: A Final Solution to the Problem of Palestine.....343

Chapter Twenty-Eight:

The Jewish-Controlled Media's Double Standards.....346

Chapter Twenty-Nine:

Close Encounters of the Worst Kind:

Jewish Agents in the Nationalist Movement.....363

Chapter Thirty:

Everyday Folks and the Problem of Anti-Semitism.....381

Chapter Thirty-One:

The Jewish Century: Jewish Power in America.....386

Chapter Thirty-Two:

Will the New Titus Arise from Russia?.....395

Chapter Thirty-Three:

Who Really Won World War II?

The Kennedy Dynasty and Jewish Power in America.....405

Chapter Thirty-Four:

Must the World Fight Another Jewish War of Survival?.....413


Chapter Thirty-Five:

The Key to World Peace.....433

Appendix:

Everybody's an Anti-Semite.....455

Index461**Other Works by Michael Collins Piper**.....467**About the Author**.....480



NO, THIS IS NOT AN ANTI-SEMITIC RIOT. Instead, this period illustration from the World War I era shows “good patriotic” Americans pillaging a store owned by a German-American businessman. Although the media today talks much of “anti-Semitic” outrages in America, few Americans know that German-Americans (as well as Italian-Americans and Japanese Americans) were subjected to this kind of bigotry and terror during wartime in America in the 20th Century. Unfortunately, only “anti-Semitism” seems to be worthy of note. Why?

THE CONFESSIONS of an ANTI-SEMITITE

How can you take Jews seriously? All they think about is anti-Semitism. They have no concern for national issues.

—General Reynaldo Bignone,
President of Argentina (1982-1983)
The Los Angeles Times, Oct. 6, 1983

The strength of the vampire is that people will not believe in him.

—Dr. Abraham Van Helsing in *Dracula*

WOLNOŚĆ BOLSZEWICKI



Although many non-Jews have questions about what the term "Jewish" means, the individuals pictured here—all prominent figures—have defined themselves as Jews and are considered to be Jewish by the popular definition of the word, no matter how much some Christians might strenuously debate who is a "Jew" (and who isn't) and which people are "the true Israel." Shown are Soviet butcher Leon Trotsky (left) and below (clockwise): Jewish Defense League terrorist Iry Rubin, famed international organized crime syndicate chief Meyer Lansky, plutocratic financier Jacob Rothschild, billionaire media baron S. I. Newhouse, Jr., global intriguer Henry Kissinger, and terrorist-turned-Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin.

A Gallery of Prominent Jewish Leaders



A Note About "Usage and Abusage" and the (Inflammatory) Title of This Book

Don't use the term "anti-Semite" in the title of your book! That was the urgent warning of a sensitive reader who saw this manuscript in rough form. "Call yourself an 'anti-Zionist,' he cautioned, adding, "Then they can't say you admit being an anti-Semite."

But I told him, laughing, "Well, for thirty years I've been branded an anti-Semite. And besides, those people who decide who's an anti-Semite—and who isn't—say that anti-Zionists are anti-Semites anyway. They say that people who call themselves 'anti-Zionist' are really just adopting code-words. I'm damned if I do and damned if I don't. It's that simple."

And that's precisely why I used the term "anti-Semite" in the title of this book—for the very purpose of driving home the point that the Jews and the Zionists (who include a lot of so-called Christians among their ranks) are constantly engaged in a very insidious form of linguistic leg-erdemain—putrid trickery of the worst sort—in order to smear those who stand in the way of the Jewish Agenda, whether it has to do with the state of Israel or some domestic affair in which the Jews, as a group, perceive themselves to have a vested interest.

And that is something that we will address *in no uncertain terms*. That is as it should be. If we cannot speak directly about a subject, then we are subjecting ourselves to self-censorship and playing the game of those who want to enforce censorship upon us.

As it stands, it is the Jews who feel that they—and only they—should have the right to define anti-Semitism and to discuss the subject under the particular parameters they deem appropriate. And as the record shows, the Jews prefer to talk (and endlessly at that) about the consequences of anti-Semitism, but not about its causes, that is, the "why" of anti-Semitism. And that's a topic in and of itself.

The point is: we *need* to discuss "anti-Semitism"—however it is defined (and there are some rather amazing definitions, at that). And there is even some debate among the Jews as to whether the term should be rendered as "anti-Semitism" or "anti-semitism" or just plain "antisemitism." In these pages I have opted for "anti-Semitism."

And while both Jews (and some non-Jews, for reasons of their own) often engage in spirited give-and-take about "who's a Jew and who isn't," the fact remains that it is the Jews who reserve for themselves the final say in answering that question, whether others like it or not.

For our purposes here, we accept, as a matter of stipulation, the Jewish definition of Israel being a "Jewish" state and the common acceptance of the concept that there is a "Jewish" people who call themselves Jews and who, more importantly, remain loyal to a Jewish Agenda, both national and international: culturally, religiously, politically.

So let us discuss this thing called "anti-Semitism"—*no holds barred*.

NEW WORLD ORDER PLEGED TO JEWS

Arthur Greenwood of British
War Cabinet Sends Message
of Assurance Here

RIGHTING OF WRONGS SEEN

which Jews have suffered and continue to suffer today because of Hitler's "disorder and lawlessness."

Mr. Greenwood, sending the Jews of America a message of "encouragement and warm good wishes," wrote:

"The tragic fate of the Jewish victims of Nazi tyranny has, as you know, filled us with a deep emotion.

The speech

men in B

League of

seven year

horror with

country has

lapse into

"The Br



Some make a mint fighting Hitler and the Nazis, but ignore the origins of the New World Order . . .

On October 6, 1940, *The New York Times* featured a revealing story reporting that Arthur Greenwood—deputy leader of the British Labor Party and member without portfolio in the British War Cabinet—had "assured the Jews of the United States that when victory was achieved an effort would be made to found a new world order based on the ideals of 'justice and peace,' and that—as the *Times* assessed it—"after the war an opportunity would be given to Jews everywhere to make a 'distinctive and constructive contribution' in the rebuilding of the world." The *Times* not only featured the phrase "New World Order" in the headline, as shown above, but in a secondary subhead repeated the concept: "New World Order Forecast." As anyone who understands the special role of the *Times* as a voice for Jewish interests—and the New World Order—knows, this specific phrasology was no accident.

Now, today, long after Hitler and the Nazis were vanquished in World War II, they are still the subject of constant discussion by Alex Jones—the self-described "biggest name" in the "truth movement," whose lucrative career was launched by a Jewish-owned television station in Texas and now sponsored by the Jewish-owned radio giant Sirius—and by Glenn Beck, the television and radio rabble-rouser made into a superstar by Zionist billionaire Rupert Murdoch's Fox News.

Through their never-ending chatter about "Hitler and the Nazis and the Holocaust," Jones and Beck (and lesser-known like-minded mimics) lend a helping hand to the perpetuation of the linguistic trickery that keeps the Jewish Agenda (underlying the New World Order) before their followers and in the forefront of public debate.

By forever ranting about the non-existent "threat" of Nazism which they claim is now rising to the fore in America and around the globe, Jones and Beck misdirect attention to Hitler and Nazism and away from the real forces that constitute the enemy of civilization.

PREFACE

Hitler and the Nazis and the Holocaust and Anti-Semitism: The Linguistic and Rhetorical Propaganda Foundation of the Drive for a New World Order

The term "anti-Semite" has become one of the most often-used (and indeed over-used) smear terms utilized today. And as we all know all too well, we often find comparisons to "Adolf Hitler" and "the Nazis" to be a frequent brickbat hurled against a variety of people with free abandon by both those on the "left" and those on the "right"—although, in reality, the terms "left" and "right" really don't mean that much anymore, if they ever meant anything at all.

In fact, if we look at this phenomenon we find that, perhaps even more so, it is those on the modern "right" who are most comfortable with raising the "Nazi" specter even more so than those on the left. Everybody from Glenn Beck—the biggest "right wing" mouth in "mainstream" media—to Alex Jones, the self-proclaimed "biggest name" in the truth movement (largely Internet-based) seems to have a preoccupation with Hitler and the Nazis—a theme concurrent with the 24/7 non-stop talk about "the Holocaust" and "anti-Semitism" in the media today.

These themes have become part of the linguistic foundation—the linguistic legerdemain—of those forces that are a part of the effort to advance what is popularly referred to as "The New World Order."

My earlier book, *The New Babylon*, explored the real history and origins of the New World Order, introducing the volume with the following assessment that is worth again referring to here:

To understand the concept of what is commonly referred to as "The New World Order"—the idea of a "one world" or "global" government—we must acknowledge these critical factors:

- THAT the origins of this grand scheme, the New World Order, do (beyond any question) lie in the ancient teachings of the Jewish Talmud;
- THAT, ultimately, the New World Order is an intended realization of the Talmudic dream of what has been called "The Jewish Utopia," that is, a global Jewish Imperium, rule of the planet by the Jewish elite;
- THAT the rise of the Zionist movement (dedicated to the creation of a Jewish state—that is, the State of Israel—as a geographic and political entity has been integral to the plan for a New World Order, the philosophical foundation of the Jewish Imperium;

- THAT the rise of International Jewish Finance and the consequent emergence of the Rothschild Dynasty as the foremost influence in that realm are central to the program for advancing the New World Order;
- THAT the consolidation of Rothschild power over the British Empire laid the foundation for the framework of the New World Order;
- THAT the United States today—as a result of Rothschild influence within—is now the virtual engine of Rothschild power, that the United States constitutes “The New Babylon” in the Jewish world view, the force to be utilized for achieving the New World Order.

In *The New Babylon*, there was no intent to suggest that “the Rothschilds” or “the Jews” or “the Zionists” are in *complete* control of the mechanism of power in our world today. However, their influence is so substantial that they can be referred to as the fulcrum upon which the *balance* of modern power rests: Every day they work relentlessly to make certain that, in the end, they do achieve *absolute* power.

There are still forces, even at high levels, resisting the Jewish Utopia. However, there are many non-Jewish powers that accept the Jewish influence as a reality that must be dealt with. These elements have thus surrendered and thus cooperate with the New World Order, hoping to be granted a few crumbs when the Jewish Utopia comes into being.

But they are fooling themselves, for they fail to understand the philosophical intentions of the New World Order so clearly outlined in Jewish teachings. In truth, the age-old Jewish dream of a New World Order—set forth in the Talmud and even found in the Old Testament—was, in a definitive sense, the driving force behind the rise of the Rothschild Empire.

The constant refrain—the mantra, the chant—about “Hitler and the Nazis” and about “the Holocaust” and “anti-Semitism” has emerged, beyond question, as the linguistic foundation for the propaganda behind the drive for the New World Order. Those who utilize this rhetoric are doing so for the purpose of negating all who stand in the way of the global Jewish agenda, perpetuating the theme that those who speak out in opposition to the New World Order are enemies of mankind—the “new Nazis”—to be shunned, silenced, jailed and, really, even to be killed.

It is no coincidence that, in recent years, major players on the global stage charged with anti-Semitism (or lending support to the opponents of Zionism) have challenged—and are targets of—the New World Order.

In *Superclass: The Global Power Elite and the World They Are Making*—a volume openly acknowledging the influence of such New World Order institutions such as Bilderberg, the Trilateral Commission and the Council on Foreign Relations—Jewish author David Rothkopf writes (approvingly) of the new global “superclass” and says the “politi-

cal fault line” for the 21st century is the battle of “Globalists vs. Nationalists”—that there is an emerging “global network of antiglobalists” who stand in opposition to the aims of the “superclass” (that is, the New World Order elite). Rothkopf summarized the nature of the conflict:

At the core of the “anti-network” is a small group of leaders, linked by many shared characteristics and attitudes though they come from widely different regions of the world.

They might be characterized as “nationalists,” or opponents of the United States, or critics of Western-led globalization. . . .

In their view, globalization is old Western imperialism dressed up in new clothes, and they are reacting to it much as they were trained to react to such incursions. . . .

Whether you characterize it as nationalist vs. internationalist, populist vs. globalist, or anti-neo-imperialist vs. pro-American globalization, the fact is that the battle lines are drawn.

Rothkopf specifically named three figures who are among that “small group of leaders” challenging the New World Order: Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Venezuelan strongman Hugo Chavez, and Russian leader Vladimir Putin. (And to that list we add such others as Malaysia’s valiant Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, no-nonsense Alexander Lukashenko of Belarus, and Syria’s courtly Bashir Assad.)

Rothkopf’s opinions are no idle chatter. He speaks from very real “insider” status, being a member of the “superclass” himself. He served as managing director of Kissinger Associates, the international consulting firm of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, one of the foremost modern-era architects of the New World Order.

So Rothkopf’s candid assessment confirms that the real conflict in our world today is—as it always has been—the fight by nationalists worldwide to preserve their nations’ sovereignty in face of the push by cosmopolitan internationalists to set in place a global imperium. Rothkopf’s admissions are a clear sign the New World Order elite recognize there are serious forces aligned against them.

Unfortunately, groups such as the John Birch Society promote the globalist line by attacking nationalists such as Ahmadinejad, Chavez and Putin, failing to recognize—or deliberately ignoring—the fact that these leaders oppose the New World Order.

The tired labels of “liberal” and “conservative” never meant anything of consequence, just as there is no difference, on major international issues, between the Democrats and Republicans. The real battle is between the globalists and the nationalists.

And as difficult as it will be for many to accept, the fact is that the Jewish power elite (and most Jews) are allied with the New World Order. This point cannot be overstated.

In addition, it should be noted that the recent avalanche of rhetoric regarding the purported threat from Islam—witness the idiotic outcry against the alleged possibility that Islamic Sharia Law might take hold in America—is also central to the propaganda that is integrally related to (and coming from essentially the same sources as) the unending talk of the dangers of “Nazism” (which died in 1945) and “anti-Semitism.”

In truth, Islam stands as a formidable force in opposition to the New World Order and that is precisely why those promoting a New World Order find it so critical to advance the anti-Islamic rhetoric in both the mass media and in the realm of so-called “independent” media as well.

Free-thinking voices—such as respected writer and broadcaster Mark Glenn—who have spoken out against the rampage against Islam that has been unleashed—even within the self-styled “truth movement”—have paid a mighty price for so doing.

As Glenn has said, “The words and rhetoric about the Nazis and Anti-Semitism and the assault upon Islam are not incidental bolts, nuts and screws within this propaganda mechanism. Rather, they are the pistons and sparkplugs—and gasoline—without which the New World Order’s machinery could not and would not function.” Glenn says it can all be reduced to a bumper-sticker style message, simple—yet profound: “Pro-Israel + Anti-Islam = New World Order.” And he’s right.

Glenn points out that the Christians and Muslims of Palestine and Iraq and Afghanistan who live under constant siege, driven from their homes, living in tents and shanties without electricity or water—all a direct consequence of wars brought upon them by Jewish power in America—know full well who the enemy really is. It is Glenn’s fear (and my fear) that it will take some drastic cataclysm here in America to wake up more Americans—including the self-dubbed “patriots”—to the truth about what the Jewish global agenda (the New World Order) really is.

(Glenn’s website at theuglytruth.wordpress.com is an elegant and eloquent fact-filled antidote to the lies and defamations of Islam and of those who stand up to Jewish power and is heartily recommended.)

So the ugly bottom-line truth is that the non-stop caterwauling about Hitler and the Nazis and about anti-Semitism—not to mention, now, “the Muslims”—is the modern-day propaganda message of the New World Order and, as such, must be rejected, exposed, fought and laid to rest.

If this dangerous demagoguery continues to flourish, the New World Order will be able to maintain a mighty arsenal of ammunition that will vanquish those who have sought to stand in its way.

The Caribbean-born philosopher, Frantz Fanon—an iconic voice in the fight against colonialism during the 20th Century—wrote of “the language of the colonized” and urged “decolonizing the mind,” saying that “every colonized people . . . finds itself face to face with the language of the civilizing nation; that is, with the culture of the mother country.”

The situation America and the West now face is precisely parallel: We have been colonized by global Zionism which is effectively constitutes “the mother country” and our language and culture are inundated—some would say “infected”—with its linguistic poison. The Zionist colonizers have thus imposed their ideology upon us. It is their insidious tactic of indoctrination and misdirection that is absolutely front and center in the realm of discussion of public affairs in our world today.

The distraction of “Nazism” and—as the likes of Alex Jones and others of his ilk would have it—the threat of “the New Nazism,” coupled with the un-ending drumbeat about “anti-Semitism” and “the Holocaust” constitute mind control mechanisms designed to prevent people from confronting the *real* forces and ideology behind the New World Order.

The truth is that when one dares to mention Jewish media control or Jewish financial influence—or just simply the Jewish lobby (with tentacles that reach into all manner of domestic affairs, far beyond its role in foreign policy—that is a direct challenge to the New World Order.

Those who have been misled and told to “say nothing” when it comes to these matters are being led to the slaughter by Judas Goats (posing as “patriot leaders”) who win great acclaim (and make big money) by “exposing” a variety of nefarious, spooky-sounding conspiracies, but who—at the same time—avoid addressing the very real down-to-earth forces behind the New World Order they claim to be fighting.

And the real irony of it all is that these same phony patriots—who avoid mentioning the Jewish origins of the New World Order—are among the loudest and most vociferous in continuing to crank up the mantra about “Hitler and the Nazis” and “the Holocaust,” even to the point of suggesting that it is actually surviving remnants of the Third Reich—yes, those “Nazis”—who are really behind the New World Order. And some even say—get this—that “The Rothschilds aren’t really Jewish.”

Based on more than three decades of study and interacting with a broad-ranging number of very real experts, I say this with conviction: Jewish power does lie at the root of the New World Order and until that is acknowledged by those who say they are fighting against this intended Global Plantation, there is no way it will be defeated.

The first step in defeating the New World Order is casting aside its propaganda—particularly that surrounding the much-discussed issue of “anti-Semitism” that we are dissecting in the pages of this volume.



The March 24, 1933 issue of *The Daily Express* of London (shown above) described how Jewish leaders, in combination with powerful global Jewish financial interests, launched a boycott of Germany for the purpose of crippling that nation's already precarious economy in hopes of bringing down the new regime of Adolf Hitler, which intended to (and did) free Germany from the grip of predatory international usurers. This little-known declaration of war on Germany was actually the first shot fired in World War II. It set the stage, not surprisingly, for retaliatory self-defense measures by the Hitler government. Nothing is ever mentioned about this pivotal event in popular reportage of World War II, precisely because it would present Germany (and the history of the war) in an entirely new light.



One of the foremost propagandists for the modern-day Holocaust Industry is not even a historian but, instead, a professor of religion. She is Deborah Lipstadt, shown above being confronted by Michael Collins Piper outside the National Archives in Washington, DC. Lipstadt is frantically waving a copy of Piper's Holocaust-related book *Best Witness* (presented to her moments before by Piper) in a frenzied attempt to prevent her photograph from being taken. Not long afterward, famed Revisionist pioneer Willis Carto also confronted Lipstadt before a large audience at the archives, much to her distress. The full story of this amusing and revealing affair is told later in these pages, beginning on page 294.

FOREWORD

But What About The Holocaust? Some People Forget That War is Hell

So what about the Holocaust—which, perhaps, is more appropriately referred to as “the Holocaust” inasmuch as it has become an iconic concept that we hear about practically every day of our lives in some form in the print and broadcast media?

There is simply no way—in light of the ever-present commemoration of that period of 20th Century history—that we can proceed further in this volume without addressing this issue right up front.

Although we’ve already explored the nature in which the rhetoric about Hitler and the Nazis and anti-Semitism has become the foundation of the propaganda in favor of the New World Order, there will always be those people—good, decent folks, to be sure—who will stop dead in their tracks and raise such questions as these:

- Considering all the terrible things that happened to the Jews of Europe during World War II, shouldn’t we be concerned about the rise of New Nazis who will stir up—and indeed are now said to be stoking—“the New Anti-Semitism”?
- Shouldn’t the “historical fact” that “Six Million Jews—Maybe as Many as Ten Million or More—Were Murdered by the Nazis” be enough reason, standing alone, to curb discussion of matters that might create hostility to Jewish people?
- Isn’t the discussion of the Jewish lobby or referencing Jewish money power on Wall Street or criticizing the state of Israel the very kind of loose (and “hateful”) talk that led to the Holocaust?

Now, although, as we’ve pointed out, there are many well-meaning people who will raise these questions—as they have been conditioned to do so by the media—the truth is that these questions are the very type of rhetorical flourishes that are also coming from those who want us to avoid confronting the New World Order head on.

The New World Order forces want good people to be attuned to the Holocaust imagery. It is part—a vital underlying element—of the linguistic trickery used to redirect attention away from very real forces that are maliciously at work in our world today.

This relentless propaganda—raising memories (often imagined memories) of “the Holocaust” and its horrors—takes us on a daily and frightening whirlwind through time, a journey into the past, where we are forced to relive horrifying events that are reported to have happened more than sixty years ago.

The effect is that in so doing we are transported out of real time, out of reality, and told to empathize and sympathize with the Jewish people

(above all others) and do nothing—in our own era—that, in some way, could interfere with the agenda of the organized Jewish community and its New World Order patrons in the Rothschild dynasty and its global network. Otherwise, we're told, there will be "another Holocaust."

Now this is neither the time nor the place to discuss what did—or did not—happen during the events and period generally referred to as the Holocaust. So many skilled researchers and writers have already addressed those questions. To attempt to even summarize their work at this juncture would be a distraction.

Suffice it to say that anyone who is interested further in the topic should refer to the bimonthly historical journal, *The Barnes Review* (see its website at barnesreview.com) and see, in particular, its special "all-Holocaust issue" (first published in January/February 2001 and still available). I am pleased to mention, by the way, that I was the "guest editor" for that particular issue, of which there are now more than 100,000 copies in circulation, both in the United States and worldwide.

That issue of *The Barnes Review* covered all manner of matters relating to the facts and the myths about the Holocaust and is as good a primer as any for learning the truths regarding that matter that the New World Order so diligently works to keep under wraps.

And if there is anyone—who for whatever reason—fails to see that the suppression of discussion about the Holocaust is a very real matter of concern to the New World Order forces, note carefully that there were fourteen different countries (all among the so-called "democratic West") where people face up to five years in prison (or more) for daring to question "official" history regarding the Holocaust.

In a world where it is perfectly fine to discuss any and all subjects, "the Holocaust" is the one and only subject where we see the power of the police state enforced so broadly, so thoroughly, so forcefully. That alone should demonstrate the power of "the Holocaust" as the political club that it constitutes on behalf of the New World Order.

So although in these pages we are not going to attempt to dissect the myths and the lies surrounding the Holocaust, we are instead going to explore a number of aspects about this topic that are relevant in the context of our understanding of "anti-Semitism" (and related talk about "Hitler and the Holocaust") as part of the linguistic propaganda foundation underscoring the drive for the New World Order.

With that having been said, let us touch upon a point about "the Holocaust" that must be understood if we are able (in any way) to recognize the circumstances that led to the massive round-up and subsequent imprisonment of Jewish people in Europe during World War II. The facts about this matter give us a better grasp of just how precisely popu-

lar understanding of the period called "the Holocaust" has become so thoroughly skewed and how this basic lack of knowledge has been manipulated by those elements that are keeping the subject alive.

So let it be said: it was the Jews who brought on World War II. That is the basic foundation of World War II history that so few know about it. Here are the facts:

Long before the widespread deportations of the Jews of Europe to concentration camps in Germany and further East, the little-known point remains: Beginning in 1933 and into the years that followed, including the early years of World War II, which officially erupted on September 1, 1939, influential Jewish voices around the world were clamoring for war against Germany and aligning the Jewish people against Germany and those elements in Europe that were allied with the Third Reich.

Essentially—and this cannot be denied—the Jewish leadership committed their own people to the status of "enemy aliens" within the framework of those regions that were under German control (or which would eventually be under German control).

This significant (if ignored) fact of history casts a new perspective on the reasons for the decision by wartime Germany to remove Jewish people from areas where they could be dangerous to the Axis war effort, precisely as U.S. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt removed all Japanese from the West Coast and put them in concentration camps.

And while there are those who will cry to heaven that this is "no justification" for the deportation of the Jews and forcing them into labor camps and other forms of detention, it is a cold, hard fact—a reality of war—that cannot be avoided.

Now before we examine the proof of this, I want to digress for a moment and relate a personal story that, as you'll see, is quite telling. Some years ago I gave a brief outline of this little-known history to a friend of mine with a wide-ranging background in the American military during the Cold War (he retired as a captain) and service with U.S. Army intelligence (including a later recruitment by the CIA, which he rejected). He had immersed himself and became fluent in German, Russian, and French and was widely read about the events of World War II and he was a militant admirer, to an extraordinary degree, of British wartime leader Winston Churchill. So no "Nazi sympathizer" was he.

However—after carefully listening to my exposition regarding all of this—my knowledgeable and experienced friend reflected a moment and said, thoughtfully, "You know, in all of my reading about that time period, I never heard any of that. That's very interesting. I can see that the Germans may have had good reason to do what they did for their own reasons of national security and defending their war effort."

He hastily added, of course, that he didn't approve of the mass extermination of the Jews—which he continued to accept as a matter of fact and which point I did not argue with him—but he acknowledged that, from a national security standpoint, the German round-up of the Jews in Germany and throughout areas of occupied Europe did make sense.

Now I will be the first to acknowledge, in all honesty, that the attitude I have expressed in regard to this matter will bring roars of anger and outrage and disgust from many people—from those well-meaning people of good will and from those with a political axe to grind—but the truth is that the Jewish Experience in Europe before and during World War II is (however extraordinary) only just a part of that period of history, a time frame in which upwards of perhaps 70 million people died as a consequence of the events of the time.

It wasn't just Jews who died—although the Jews really don't want people to remember that.

And for those who doubt that the Jews want to have the legend of the Holocaust all for themselves, they need only refer to the Internet where there are a host of stories, from all manner of sources, documenting the fact that organized Jewish groups have repeatedly whooped up a big loud howl whenever non-Jews (Catholics, Lutherans, Poles, Hungarians, homosexuals—you name it) have tried, for their own reasons, to grab a piece of the Jewish-baked Holocaust pie.

For the historical record, it is well worth looking at the Jewish provocations against Germany—angry threats and declarations that appeared in the mass media (and in the Jewish community press) at the time. We cite these examples recognizing, of course, that Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933 after a decade of denouncing Jewish power, but hasten to point out that—as even many “mainstream” historians have acknowledged (although few people know it)—the truth is that, in the earliest days of Hitler's rule, neither Hitler nor his regime had much to say publicly about the Jews, (nor did they enact any particular policies that ran roughshod over Jewish interests).

Now, again, this is something that is little known, but it is an absolute fact and a fact that must—repeat MUST—be considered when weighing the words of the Jewish spokesmen who (even in the earliest days of the Third Reich) were working to bring global economic and political power against the German government.

Note, first of all, perhaps the best known of the early rantings against Third Reich Germany that appeared as a front-page headline story in *The Daily Express* of London on March 24, 1933—hardly more than two months after Hitler became chancellor. The headline declared: “Judea Declares War on Germany,” and the story reported:

All Jews worldwide declared war on the Third Reich. The Israeli people around the world declare economic and financial war against Germany. Fourteen million Jews stand together as one man, to declare war against Germany. The Jewish wholesaler will forsake his firm, the banker his stock exchange, the merchant his commerce and the pauper his pitiful shed in order to join together in a holy war against Hitler's people.

Compare that rhetoric with what would happen today if a major London newspaper reported that “All Muslims worldwide declared war on the United States.” There would be major clamoring for the round-up of Muslims on American soil—and that's a fact.

And while, of course, literally not “all Jews worldwide” had formally declared war on Germany, the impact (and the intent) was just the same. In fact, the Jewish declaration of war resulted in a global economic boycott—largely based in the United States and other places where Jewish influence was substantial—that caused serious harm to the still-crippled German economy, threatening to bring Germany to its knees.

(The full circumstances of this matter are detailed in American Jewish writer Edwin Black's much-heralded and widely-publicized 1984 work, *The Transfer Agreement*, published by Macmillan.)

Shortly thereafter, on June 16, 1933, famed and influential Zionist leader Vladimir Jabotinsky, operating out of Poland and throughout Europe and Palestine, told the Jewish world:

We [Jews] must destroy, destroy, destroy them, not only with the boycott, but politically, supporting all existing forces against them to isolate Germany from the civilized world . . . our enemy [Germany] must be destroyed.

The harsh reality of the words of Jabotinsky—one of the leading figures in the Zionist movement working to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine—clearly demonstrate that the popular refrain (even on the part of anti-Semites) that “The Zionists collaborated with the Nazis” is just simply not as extraordinary as so many naive folks, particularly within the American “patriot” movement, like to think.

In fact, Jews in Palestine and Zionists in Europe and worldwide were closing ranks *against* the Third Reich, despite the fact that there was this brief, temporary cooperation between the Reich and certain Zionist elements in Germany who shared one tactical concern: arranging the departure from Europe of numbers of Jews who wanted to emigrate to Palestine (the history of which is outlined in the aforementioned work, *The Transfer Agreement*, by Edwin Black).

In New York City, not long after Jabotinsky's provocation, one of the most powerful Jewish leaders in America, attorney Samuel Untermyer, gave a speech broadcast nationally over WABC radio on August 6, 1933 in which he told his audience to join in the boycott of Germany. Critics called it Untermyer's "Sacred War" speech. He said, in part:

Each of you, Jew and Gentile alike, who has not already enlisted in this sacred war should do so now and here. It is not sufficient that you should buy no goods made in Germany.

You must refuse to deal with any merchant or shopkeeper who sells any German-made goods or who patronizes German ships or shipping.... we will undermine the Hitler regime and bring the German people to their senses by destroying their export trade on which their very existence depends.

So the truth is that—early on—powerful organized Jewish groups were already proving a serious threat to the national security of the German nation. *And this was just the beginning.*

In January of 1934 Zionist leader Jabotinsky upped the ante when he reflected on the Jewish campaign against Germany:

The fight against Germany has now been waged for months by every Jewish community, on every conference, in all labor unions and by every single Jew in the world.

There are reasons for the assumption that our share in this fight is of general importance. We shall start a spiritual and material war of the whole world against Germany.

Germany is striving to become once again a great nation, and to recover her lost territories as well as her colonies.

But our Jewish interests call for the complete destruction of Germany. Collectively and individually, the German nation is a threat to us Jews.

Lest anyone be inclined to dismiss these as the words of a "fanatic" (although they were), note too that—during that same time frame—David A. Brown, the national chairman of the United Jewish Campaign in the United States, declared: "We Jews are going to bring a war on Germany." And that was the Jewish rallying cry, one that was being trumpeted all across the United States.

In June of 1934 widely-renowned Jewish writer Emil Ludwig Cohen, writing in *Les Annales*, said forthrightly and in no uncertain terms: "Hitler will have war—he does not want war—but we will force it on him, not this year, but soon."

The passage of time did not bring about any softening of the Jewish attitude, despite the fact that many Jews remained in Germany under Hitler's rule and thus subject to possible retaliation. In 1937 Jewish professor A. Kulischer wrote:

Germany is the enemy of Judaism and must be pursued with deadly hatred.

The goal of Judaism of today is: a merciless campaign against all German peoples and the complete destruction of the nation.

We demand a complete blockade of trade, the importation of raw materials stopped, and *retaliation towards every German, woman and child.* (Emphasis added.)

In 1938, Jewish author Pierre Creange, writing in his book, *Epîtres aux Juifs*, sounded the global trumpet:

Our fight against Germany must be carried to the limit of what is possible. Israel has been attacked. Let us, therefore, defend Israel! Against the awakened Germany, we put an awakened Israel. And the world will defend us.

War, of course, finally erupted on September 1, 1939 and just days afterward, Chaim Weizmann, president of both the international Jewish Agency and of the World Zionist Organization (and later Israel's first president), told British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain in a letter published in *The London Times* on September 6, 1939 that:

I wish to confirm, in the most explicit manner, the declarations which I and my colleagues have made during the last month, and especially in the last week, that the Jews stand by Great Britain and will fight on the side of the democracies. Our urgent desire is to give effect to these declarations [against Germany].

We wish to do so in a way entirely consonant with the general scheme of British action, and therefore would place ourselves, in matters big and small, under the coordinating direction of His Majesty's Government. The Jewish Agency is ready to enter into immediate arrangements for utilizing Jewish manpower, technical ability, resources, etc.

In other words, very simply, "the Jews"—Weizmann's words, not "some Jews"—were joining in the war against Germany.

And, obviously, this was not something that went un-noticed by the German people or their leaders.

On September 13, the *Central Blad Voor Israeliten*, a Dutch Jewish newspaper, echoed Weizmann, railing that "The millions of Jews who live in America, England and France, North and South Africa, and, not to forget those in Palestine, are determined to bring the war of annihilation against Germany to its final end."

And on February 10, 1940, *les Nouvelles Littéraires*, summed it up in some rather revealing words: "Even if we Jews are not bodily with you in the trenches, we are nevertheless morally with you. This is *our war*, and you are fighting it for us."

All of these similar and repetitive declarations make it unfortunately all too clear: *the worldwide Jewish leadership had, on behalf of the Jewish people, declared war against Germany*, long before World War II actually broke out. And once that war was under way, the Jewish leadership further vowed support for England and, naturally, against Germany.

Can there thus be *any* doubt as to why Germany began massive round-ups and deportations of Jews in Germany and throughout Europe? No American today who expresses concerns about "homeland security" can *honestly* question why Germany did what it did at a time of war. And, as noted earlier, we can only recall the similar actions taken against Japanese Americans by the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In short, if Jews truly wish to have open discussion about the tragic events of World War II, they had damned well better start telling the *entire* story as to why their people ended up in the concentration camps where so many Jews died of disease and starvation during World War II.

All of which brings up the manner in which the Jews have used the Holocaust and the imagery surrounding us as a bitter and brutal club to push forward their long dream of a Jewish Utopia—a New World Order.

It has been probably their most effective propaganda tool and, as we saw earlier, even some well-known American "patriot" types have fallen into the trap of echoing this New World Order rhetoric.

The use of the Holocaust in this manner, put simply, is designed to silence any and all who might declare their independence from the New World Order or express opinions that might deviate from the approved lines of thought enforced by the Jewish-dominated media.

In short, if you dare to challenge Jewish power, you are allied with Hitler—the Man Who Brought the World the Jewish Holocaust.

The warped and even disturbing nature of the Jewish attitude toward the Holocaust can be found in the 1989 book, *Holocaust: Religious and Philosophical Implications*, edited by John K. Roth and Michael Berenbaum, published by Paragon House.

There we find the most bizarre and remarkable thing: a reference to Terrence Des Pres, the author of a book about the Holocaust entitled *The*

Survivor: An Anatomy of Life in the Death Camps. Introducing a chapter from that book, entitled "Excremental Assault," Roth and Berenbaum quote one Emil Fackenheim who was speaking at a conference on the work of illustrious Holocaust Industry professional Elie Wiesel and there, at the time, was a discussion of Des Pres' book.

Describing Fackenheim's "whispery voice" (which seems to be common to many Holocaust Industry types), they note that Fackenheim uttered the following truly grotesque (but, in many respects, typical) commentary about Des Pres' writings: "I never use the word 'shit,' but the way Terrence Des Pres uses it, it becomes a holy word."

No, Fackenheim is not a back-alley pornographer or a Borscht Belt comic in the Catskills or a Jewish crime syndicate enforcer. Instead, this character—who says the word "shit" becomes "holy" when used by Des Pres—was trained as a rabbi and later ensconced at the University of Toronto as a "preeminent Jewish philosopher," hailed universally as both a militant Zionist and strong advocate of Orthodox Judaism.

In a similar vein, Jewish writer Israel Charny wrote a book on the topic of genocide and—recalling his reading of "Nazi hunter" Simon Wiesenthal's book, *The Murderers Among Us*—commented:

All of us must know how depraved men can be so that we can fight the madness around us . . . and in us . . .

The reading becomes exciting . . . One murderous incident follows another . . . My excitement mounts . . .

It is almost a sexual feeling . . . I flow into the next account of a killing and become one with the murderer . . .

Part of me still says this could never be me . . . but I am increasingly excited, and it is almost as if I am experiencing myself as one of the killers whom I swore I could never be.

In short, "the Holocaust" recalled in Holocaust writings as both a scatological and sado-masochistic sexual sensation. And remember: these were the words of Jewish writers—one of them a respected rabbi—not something dreamed up by a "hate-filled anti-Semite."

Reflecting on the commentary by the aforementioned Israel Charny, British writer Tim Cole wrote in his 1999 book, *Selling the Holocaust* (published by the distinguished academic firm, Routledge):

There are surely mixed motives in visiting "Auschwitz," just as much as there are in encountering the "Holocaust" in a book or film. On a more mundane—but still vitally important—level we can see the nature of "The Holocaust" in modern world life.

In his provocative work, which took issue with the exploitation of the Holocaust—subtitled “From Auschwitz to Schindler: How History is Bought, Packaged and Sold”—Cole reflected on what he called “Holocaust tourism” and the phenomenon of the surviving remnants of the Auschwitz concentration camp having evolved into what he referred to as “Auschwitz Land.” He commented:

It is the ultimate rubber-necker's experience of passing by and gazing at someone else's tragedy. In visiting the sites of death we are afforded a degree of titillation, albeit titillation camouflaged by more “worthy” reasons for visiting.

Cole has summarized the ubiquitous nature of discussion of the Holocaust throughout the Western media:

... [We] have come now come to the point where Jewish culture in particular, and Western culture more generally, are saturated with the “Holocaust.” Indeed the “Holocaust” has saturated Western culture to such an extent that it appears not only centre stage, but also lurks in the background. . . .

The Holocaust has emerged—in the Western World—as probably the most talked about and oft-represented event of the 20th Century. . . . It is rare to read a newspaper in Britain or America—especially the Sunday papers—for more than a month without spotting a “Holocaust” story about Nazi gold, Swiss bank accounts, or a review of the latest book/film/play/exhibition on a “Holocaust” theme.

Cole wryly cited the words of the Jewish historian, Yaffa Eliach, who said: “There's no business like Shoah business.” (“Shoah” being the Hebrew word today representing “The Holocaust”) And Cole also pointed out that in 1996 a “Holocaust cookbook” was published in New York.

There is no realm, it seems, in which “The Holocaust” is ignored nor any realm to which it will not ultimately be linked.

And while Cole doesn't say this, this phenomenon of propaganda does indeed point toward the undeniable reality that “The Holocaust” is very much embedded in the rhetoric of the New World Order.

In fact, “The Holocaust” is *central* to the linguistic foundation of the New World Order—although even many American patriots do not seem to understand that point. Instead, they hype the Holocaust rhetoric just as enthusiastically—*maybe even more enthusiastically*—than the leading propaganda voices of the official Holocaust Industry itself.

In many respects, the Holocaust is also being used to bring the entirety of the Jewish people (particularly in America) into line. Cole noted that American Jews have increasingly come to consider the Holocaust as the underlying basis of Jewish identity, rather than Jewish history and tradition itself:

As a 1989 American Jewish Committee survey discovered, while only 46% of American Jews felt it was important to practice Jewish rituals, 85% said that the Holocaust was important. There is little question that in the 1970s and 1980s “The Holocaust” [Cole's quotation marks] assumed the critical role in the self-definition as Jewish.

Israeli Holocaust historian Yehudah Bauer has recognized this fact and noted the preponderance of the Holocaust as a force in modern society. Bauer wrote:

Whether presented authentically or inauthentically, in accordance with the historical facts, or in contradiction to them, with empathy or understanding or as a monumental kitsch, the Holocaust has become a ruling symbol in our culture. I am not sure whether this is good or bad, but it seems to be a fact.

Now while there are many people of good will who rush forward to say, “But it wasn't only the Jews who died in the Holocaust. Why, that damned Hitler killed millions of other people, too. He was a bad man. And a lot of people from a lot of countries died during the war as well.”

What those folks who say this don't realize is that when they mention the many other people who died (from a variety of causes) during World War II (including in the concentration camps) they are actually saying something that is officially not approved by even the most eminent promoters of “The Holocaust.”

Confirming evidence of this can be found in the work of one of the most arrogant beings ever to spread his bile on this planet, Elie Wiesel, a much-touted Nobel Prize winner whose never-ending talk about the Holocaust makes him a daily feature in the media.

In his 1999 memoir, *And the Sea Is Never Full*—rife with self-promotion, a hallmark of his pompous pronouncements treated by the media as if holy scripture—Wiesel makes it clear that Jews and only Jews are the people who underwent very special suffering during World War II. (Wiesel really is a piece of work. For more on his intrigues, see the informative website of Carolyn Yeager at carolynyeager.com.)

Particularly amusing about Wiesel's book are his vicious, concerted attacks on famed "Nazi hunter" Simon Wiesenthal—apparently perceived by Wiesel as a rival for access to lucrative Holocaust industry money and glory. But while all of this is entertaining for a reader with a critical eye—learning of these internecine Jewish squabbles over that favorite topic (The Holocaust)—what is truly revealing is Wiesel's discussion of former President Jimmy Carter during and after the ground-breaking of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. Wiesel sniffed:

President Carter speaks movingly and conveys a strong sense of history, but I am troubled by his reference to "eleven million victims." In the car that takes us back to the White House I ask him where he had obtained this figure. The source: the writings and speeches of Simon Wiesenthal. He insists on including all the victims: six million Jews and five million non-Jews.

I tell the president that this figure does not reflect the facts. The president is astonished: "Are you saying that there were no non-Jews in the camps?" I explain to him that yes, there were, and some of them were heroes of the resistance and brave humanists, but that they did not number five million; they were a fraction of that figure. Among the others there were fierce anti-Semites and sadistic criminals whom the Germans released from their prisons in order to supervise the camps.

"Would it be just, Mr. President, to honor their memory together with that of my parents?" The president never cited this figure again.

What an arrogant Jew! This much-heralded figure rejects the victimhood of all but the Jews. And he is not the only Jew saying this. And it is no wonder that there are so many people saying, in response: "We're tired of hearing about 'The Holocaust,' because—in fact—people are.

Fortunately there are some Jews who recognize the vile nature of the attitude expressed by Wiesel. For example, in her book, *Stars of David: Prominent Jews Talk About Being Jewish* (Broadway Books, 2005), Abigail Pogrebin reported that Jewish television news pioneer Don Hewitt of CBS—best known for his role in the popular "Sixty Minutes"—believes that Jewish interests are hurt by Jews who say their suffering surpasses all others'. Hewitt told her:

I once said to Steven Spielberg: "You would do your cause a lot better if you would acknowledge that the Jews weren't the only ones who ever suffered a Holocaust."

According to Hewitt, "We can not go on believing that nobody else had *tsuris* but us. There are a lot of people, there are a lot of Blacks, who say, 'holocaust, shmalocaust: We got lynched!' And they are right."

Hewitt described attending a party where he was attacked by media baron and powerful Jewish community figure, Mortimer Zuckerman, and Jewish media personality, Barbara Walters, who berated him, saying, "How could you do that story at this terrible time in Israel's history?" (referring to a "Sixty Minutes" broadcast critical of Israel).

Hewitt said that he responded: "How about the stories we did at that terrible time in America's history in Vietnam? Were you worried about that." Hewitt said he was "shocked" at the attitude of Zuckerman and Walters and then commented:

I get accused of being a self-hating Jew because I'm critical of Menachem Begin. Nobody ever called me a self-hating American because I was critical of Richard Nixon.

There's a thing about Jewishness . . .

Right now the Jews are too big and too smart to cave in to this feeling that we are victims in the Middle East. They're not really victims in the Middle East.

With such remarks, Hewitt clearly marked himself a thoughtful human being who set himself aside from the thinking that—by any knowledgeable person's estimation—readily reflects the mind-set of most members of the organized Jewish community. He added:

I never understood why the smartest people on Earth plunked themselves down in the most hostile place on Earth. They could have found a better place. They could have gone to Madagascar or something, but they say, "It's the land that God gave them." Who the heck knows what God gave anybody? How do they know that? I think it would be a big loss to civilization if Israel disappeared. I just wish they would get off all this jazz about "God gave us this land"; God didn't give you the land. You took the land and you made it great. I love you for doing that, but don't tell me that God gave you this land and he doesn't want anybody else here.

With appropriate irony, all things considered, Hewitt described to Pogrebin what he called his "favorite phone call." A woman called after "Sixty Minutes" had aired a story on Israel and she said, "I'm getting sick and tired of you people," and Hewitt responded, "Okay, lady, what now?"

She said, "You're all pro-Israel and you're all a bunch of kikes." Hewitt responded, "On your first point you couldn't be more wrong. On your second point, you could be right." He then hung up on the lady who obviously had no idea of Hewitt's honest outlook.

So it is ironic, indeed, that Don Hewitt should be subjected to classic "anti-Semitism" (stirred up by concerns about Israel's misdeeds) when, in fact, he was one Jew who did dare to speak out.

The sad further irony of all of this exploitation of "The Holocaust" by the Jews is that there is nonetheless a serious strand of thought within the Jewish community itself that the emphasis and focus on the Holocaust is a very real threat in its own unique way to Jewish survival.

And this should be of concern to those people of good will who insist that they are not "anti-Semitic" and that they are concerned about the Holocaust (or the potential of a future such tragedy).

One Jewish writer, Esther Benbassa—a professor of Modern Jewish History at the Ecole pratique des hautes études (Sorbonne) in Paris and the author of many respected studies of Jewish history—has written a thought-provoking volume, entitled *Suffering as Identity: The Jewish Paradigm*, the winner of the 2008 Guizot Prize of the Académie Française and which was published in English in 2010 by Verso Books. Those devoted to the Holocaust must consider her very striking warnings about the dangers that repetitive Holocaust rhetoric represents:

Victims are not ennobled by their suffering. On the contrary, the perception of one's own victimhood is likely to breed a desire for compensation and an inclination to play the tyrant with others. It is time to abandon the idea that the Holocaust is the one and only founding event of Jewish history and that being Jewish comes down to regarding oneself as the victim of non-Jews. No individual or group identity can be sustained on such grounds. If the genocide is treated as the alpha and omega of Jewish history, then Judaism is inevitably doomed to disappear. "Holocaustmania," as [Jewish writer] Jacob Neusner calls it, is impoverishing Jewish spiritual life.

Just after the war, the Holocaust occupied a minor place in Jewish American life; the same held for France. The book by the great American sociologist Nathan Glazer, written in this period, refers to the destruction of European Jewry only in passing. The contrast with the 1970s, especially in the United States, a country in which the Jews were not directly confronted with the genocide, is overwhelming. Today, it is not possible to address the Jewish world without referring to the Final Solution.

Does this not create a situation, particularly in Europe, in which the only way the younger generation can learn about the Jews is by way of the genocide—by way of their destruction rather than their long existence on the continent and the contributions they have made and continue to make to their respective countries?

Thanks to the obsession that surrounds it and the civil religion it has spawned, the genocide has become the main theme of public discourse about the Jews and Judaism. One episode in the Jewish experience, a most fateful one, has taken the place of a millennial Jewish history. . . .

The Holocaust has not only established itself as a new secular religion, alongside the Judaism of the written and oral Law; in the process of acquiring this status, it has made it possible to put victimhood in general on a pedestal, endowing it with an added measure of "prestige."

Is the survival of Judaism forever to depend on anti-Semitism, which alone can sustain this sense of victimhood? In either case, we would be confronted with a bloodless, futureless Judaism, standing over and against the Judaism of the traditions and practice. Many contemporary Jews are haunted by this fear. Is there no room for another kind of Judaism?

For as long as the sole alternative to a Judaism of faith and observance is a Judaism based on victimhood and suffering, there is every reason to fear that the latter will soon have breathed its last, for lack of a viable future.


Profound words indeed. Those who value Judaism as one of "the Great Religions"—as it is often called—need to keep all of this in mind.

Unfortunately, the fact is that most Jews—not to mention many millions of other people under their intellectual sway—have come to adopt the rhetoric about "anti-Semitism" and about "the Holocaust"—a mantra that, as we've said, is a powerful weapon in the arsenal of the New World Order and its drive to establish a Global Plantation: the Jewish Utopia.

No serious opponent of the New World Order should ever rant and rave about "Hitler and the Nazis" or about "The Holocaust." They are only advancing the New World Order by so doing.

So what about the Holocaust? It is over and done with.

It is now up to the real grass-roots patriots in America and around the globe to call their so-called "leaders" on the carpet, to call them to account, when those "leaders" adopt the rhetoric of the New World Order—even including when it comes to the matter of the Holocaust.



Outspoken Jewish critics of Israel and Zionism . . .



When people call me an "anti-Semite," I enjoy saying, "Well, let me tell you about some of my friends." Among the eminent Jewish critics of Israel whom I've been pleased to call personal friends include (clockwise): no-nonsense civil libertarian firebrand Mark Lane, the energetic Haviv Schieber, an early Jewish pioneer in pre-Israel Palestine and the first Jewish mayor of Beersheva, the late Jack Bernstein, author of *The Life of an American Jew in Racist-Marxist Israel*, the colorful Charles L. Fischbein, former executive director of the Jewish National Fund, and—last but far from least—the one and only Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, the first major American Jewish critic of Zionism, who honored me immensely by asking me to collaborate with him on his memoirs, a task that, unfortunately, didn't fit into my schedule at the time. And although today there are many who speak in awe and with hushed tones of the late Benjamin Freedman, the legendary Jewish-born New York millionaire who converted to Roman Catholicism and became an outspoken critic of Zionism and Judaism, the fact is that Freedman (lower left) was a friend (and great admirer) of my longtime friend and associate Willis Carto, who sponsored Freedman's now-world-famous speech on Zionism in Washington, DC.

INTRODUCTION

Yes, YOU, too, are an Anti-Semite . . .

Before proceeding upon an exposition of my own journey in the murky world of "anti-Semitism"—however defined—it is vital to explain precisely why that term has become so perverted, so misused, so misunderstood, so distorted. The sad truth is that there are many people (perhaps billions of people) who are subject to the same kind of smears levelled against me. And this is vital to understand, because you—dear reader—may well one day be accused of being an "anti-Semite" yourself.

In our modern era the accusation of "anti-Semitism" has come to be the most feared of all labels. Many people who are simply critics of Israel or critics of Zionism—the ideological movement generally defined as the driving force behind the establishment of Israel as a geographic and political entity in the Middle East—frequently profess that they are simply "anti-Zionist, not anti-Semitic." They will protest in well-meaning (and *often sincerely meant*) terms that "Judaism is not Zionism and Zionism is not Judaism," citing the fact that there are anti-Zionist Jews.

Yet, for general public consumption, the fact is that even Merriam Webster's authoritative *Third New International Dictionary - Unabridged* defines anti-Semitism as follows: "1) hostility toward Jews as a religious or racial minority group, often accompanied by social, political or economic discrimination (2) opposition to Zionism (3) sympathy for the opponents of Israel."

When Arab American groups—among others—raised questions with Merriam Webster about this definition (which is broad and all-encompassing, to say the least), and asked the distinguished company to correct the dictionaries and rephrase the definition in future editions, the company said it had no plans to immediately change the definition, but suggested that perhaps the definition would be changed in a future edition of the volume.

What is interesting, though, is that Ken Jacobson, associate national director of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL)—a group about whom we will learn much in the pages that follow—said, in response to the critics, that defining anti-Semitism as "opposition to Zionism" was "close enough" to be a legitimate definition, adding that "Zionism is the national expression of the Jewish people, and to deny that, it seems to me, most often reflects anti-Semitic views," he said. "It's an attack on the collectivity of the Jewish people."

Thus, even those good folks who protest that they aren't anti-Semites but just "anti-Zionist" are still in the doghouse, and defined as "anti-Semites" even in the pivotal dictionary of the English language.

In the February 2002 edition of *Commentary*—the longtime journal of the respected American Jewish Committee—Hillel Halkin (reflecting on “The Return of Anti-Semitism”) made no bones about the matter, writing: “Israel is the state of the Jews. Zionism is the belief that the Jews should have a state. To defame Israel is to defame the Jews.”

On March 15, 2009—writing in *The Los Angeles Times* (owned by billionaire Jewish Zionist Sam Zell)—no less a revered figure than Dr. Judea Pearl, the father of the martyred Jewish journalist, Daniel Pearl—tragically murdered, it is said, by Muslim fundamentalists—addressed the question “Is anti-Zionism hate?” and concluded: “Yes. It is more dangerous than anti-Semitism, threatening lives and peace in the Middle East.”

In razor-sharp terms, Pearl cut across the swath of criticism of Zionism and Israel and enunciated the theme that has become the mantra of the Jewish political and intellectual establishment (with few voices rising to counter the proposition). He wrote:

Anti-Zionism rejects the very notion that Jews are a nation—a collective bonded by a common history—and, accordingly, denies Jews the right to self-determination in their historical birthplace. It seeks the dismantling of the Jewish nation-state: Israel.

Anti-Zionism earns its discriminatory character by denying the Jewish people what it grants to other historically bonded collectives (e.g. French, Spanish, Palestinians), namely, the right to nationhood, self-determination and legitimate coexistence with other indigenous claimants. Anti-Semitism rejects Jews as equal members of the human race; anti-Zionism rejects Israel as an equal member in the family of nations.

... There are of course Jews who are non-Zionists and even anti-Zionists. The ultra-Orthodox cult of Neturei Karta and the leftist cult of Noam Chomsky are notable examples. The former rejects any earthly attempt to interfere with God’s messianic plan, while the latter abhors all forms of nationalism, especially successful ones.

There are also Jews who find it difficult to defend their identity against the growing viciousness of anti-Israel propaganda, and eventually hide, disown or denounce their historical roots in favor of social acceptance and other expediencies.

But these are marginal minorities at best; the vital tissues of Jewish identity today feed on Jewish history and its natural derivatives—the state of Israel, its struggle for survival, its cultural and scientific achievements and its relentless drive for peace.

Given this understanding of Jewish nationhood, anti-Zionism is in many ways more dangerous than anti-Semitism. . .

It is anti-Zionism, then, not anti-Semitism that poses a more dangerous threat to lives, historical justice and the prospects of peace in the Middle East.

So for those who have taken refuge in proclaiming themselves simply “anti-Zionist,” then, Pearl says that they—in fact—actually, in his words, pose “a more dangerous threat.”

And therefore, even those self-proclaimed “anti-Zionist” voices are just as deadly as those old-fashioned “anti-Semites” in the mold of Adolf Hitler and so many others of so many races, creeds and colors throughout history who have been assigned that horrific label.

Of course, the “anti-Zionists” will scream out in disgust and fervently explain that they are not against Jews, they have no problem with the Jewish religion, that Judaism is one of the “great religions” and Jews have been major contributors to mankind. They will say people such as Pearl and other like-minded voices are just wrong, downright wrong. *But the fact is that Judea Pearl and others like him are the voices that receive the most attention—the only serious attention—in the Jewish controlled media outlets in America and around the globe.*

In 2003, longtime feminist Phyllis Chesler—a Jewish woman—turned her attention to anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism in a screed that can only be called a “screamer.”

Her book—her rant—entitled *The New Anti-Semitism: The Current Crisis and What We Must Do About It* (published by Jossey-Bass) described how Chesler was driven to express her views about these matters: “A fever burned in me. The task gave me no rest.” She even denounced fellow feminists who are critical of Israel and Zionism.

Chesler cried that: “Islamic reactionaries and Western intellectuals and progressives who may disagree on every other subject have agreed that Israel and America are the cause of all evil.” Today, she asserted, the word “Israel” is—or so she said—“far too dangerous a word to pronounce in a Western intellectual or social setting,” Chesler claimed:

There’s a thrilling permissibility in the air—the kind of electrically-charged and altered reality that acid-trippers or epileptics may experience just prior to a seizure: purple haze, unreality, disassociation from normalcy, responsibility. Jews and Zionists are being blamed for 9-11 in Chinese as well as Arabic. Nobel Prize winners, European and American academics, anti-globalization activists, and Jews on the left have all condemned Israel for daring to defend itself while remaining menacingly silent about the suicide bombings of Israeli citizens.

In fact, even as much as Chesler's work is a defense of Israel, it was equally a no-holds-barred blast against Muslims and the Islamic faith. Echoing semi-literate bigots who have no understanding or knowledge about Muslims or Islam—except what they've heard from the likes of Glenn Beck and from Zionist-controlled sources such as Fox News (and those that parrot its propaganda)—Chesler shrieked:

If we do not stop them, Islamic Jihadists will surely remove the precious jewels from our houses of worship and our museums, melt down the gold and the silver, and blow up our most beautiful churches and synagogues [and] build mosques right over them.

Muslims have been doing exactly this in the Muslim world for more than a thousand years, and they continue to do so today. The moderates among them have not stopped them. Jihadists will destroy our most beautiful paintings and sculptures, especially those of non-Islamic religious figures and those of naked women . . .

Ultimately, Chesler lays it out: Criticizing Israel and Zionism is not just a threat to the Jews of Israel but to all of the Jews of the world:

I am forced to conclude—it is as plain as the nose on my face—the new anti-Semite is an anti-Zionist, that is, someone who is willing to deny a national refuge to only one group in the world—the long-oppressed Jews. They assume that every other group on earth deserves its own nation, no matter how barbaric its leaders and citizens may be . . .

Insisting that you are an anti-Zionist—but not, God forbid, an anti-Semite—endangers millions of Jews who live in Israel and everywhere else.

Scratch the veneer of most politically-correct anti-Zionists and you will find a virulent anti-Semite.

So in the end, this is the chant that prevails and reverberates today. Say anything critical—no matter how mild—about Israel or about Jewish political power and you are called an “anti-Semite.”

And those who have been labeled as such must now recognize that there are—ongoing, at the highest levels—serious efforts to institute and level criminal penalties against those deemed to be anti-Semitic.

In 2009, a senior Republican member of the House of Representatives, Rep. Chris Smith (N.J.), told the Jewish Telegraph Agency (JTA)—which calls itself the “global news service of the Jewish

people”—that “serious penalties” should be imposed on the perpetrators of “anti-Semitism.”

Smith issued his call for “serious penalties” to be imposed on “anti-Semites” during the February 16-17, 2009 conclave of the London Conference on Anti-Semitism, which was attended by 120 parliamentarians from 40 countries. *The Jewish Chronicle* of London said the gathering was a virtual “who’s who of world politics.” The JTA cited Michael Gove, a member of the British Parliament in attendance at the conference, as having proclaimed that “Anti-Zionism is the new anti-Semitism.”

Other conference attendees said that recent criticisms of Israel's actions in Gaza against Christian, Muslim and secular Arabs, comparing Israel's misdeeds to National Socialist Germany's measures against European Jews, were also manifestations of “anti-Semitism.”

Irwin Cotler, a member of the Canadian Parliament, asserted that any effort to disconnect anti-Zionism from anti-Semitism was totally false; in other words, those who call themselves “anti-Zionist” but who say they are not “anti-Semitic” are, in fact, “anti-Semitic,” despite their protestations to the contrary.

In addition, the American congressman, Smith, said that “Holocaust remembrance and tolerance education must dramatically expand, and we need to ensure that our respective laws punish those who hate and incite violence against Jews.”

This is particularly dangerous inasmuch as Smith and his colleagues believe that criticism of the Jewish Agenda (in whatever form) and criticism of Israel do cause “hate” and do “incite violence against Jews.”

Although there are now in place so-called “hate crime” measures in the United States that increase criminal penalties on individuals who have been found to have committed crimes of violence ostensibly motivated by “anti-Semitism” or “racism,” the clear intent of the London conference was to further lay the groundwork for instituting legislation specifically geared to penalizing *any form of speech or expression that is perceived to be hostile to Jewish interests or the state of Israel*.

During the conference the attendees issued a formal declaration vowing to fight “anti-Semitism,” saying that the phenomenon has risen to worldwide levels that they asserted—according to the JTA—“[have] not been seen since the Holocaust.”

The declaration specifically charged Iran and Venezuela were demonstrating manifestations of “government-backed anti-Semitism in general and state-backed genocidal anti-Semitism in particular.”

Included in the American delegation (led by Smith) were Abraham Foxman, national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the lobby for Israel which also functions as an asset of Israel's intelli-

gence service, and Deborah Lipstadt, a professor of religion, touted as an "expert" on what she and others say is "holocaust denial." (Lipstadt herself admitted in her book, *History on Trial*, that she had once acted as an informant for Israeli intelligence during a trip to the Soviet Union.)

In conjunction with all of this grand braying about "anti-Semitism," the United States government itself established—via an act of Congress entitled the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act of 2004—an all-new division of the U.S. State Department called the Office of the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism.

This office promptly rushed forth with a report entitled *Contemporary Global Anti-Semitism* which, among other things, incorporated a "Working Definition of 'Anti-Semitism'" hammered out by the European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia—yet another of the international groups (and they are multiple in number) devoted to the frenzy surrounding the profitable issue of "fighting anti-Semitism."

The actual text of the document of the "working definition" is revealing indeed, demonstrating that the term "anti-Semitism" is now generally accepted to be so broad-ranging that virtually anything—repeat: anything—said about Israel and the Jewish people worldwide (even to the point of suggesting that Jews have substantial influence beyond their numbers) does constitute anti-Semitism. Here is the exact text of this extraordinary document:

The purpose of this document is to provide a practical guide for identifying incidents, collecting data, and supporting *the implementation and enforcement of legislation dealing with anti-Semitism*. [Emphasis added.]

Working definition: "Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities."

In addition, such manifestations could also target the state of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collectivity.

Antisemitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity, and it is often used to blame Jews for "why things go wrong."

It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms and action, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits. Contemporary examples of antisemitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the religious sphere could—taking into account the overall context—include, but are not limited to:

- Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.

- Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective—such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.

- Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.

- Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).

- Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.

- Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.

Examples of the ways in which antisemitism manifests itself with regard to the State of Israel taking into account the overall context could include:

- Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor.

- Applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.

- Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis.

- Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.

- Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.

However, criticism of Israel similar to that leveled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic.

Antisemitic acts are criminal when they are so defined by law (for example, denial of the Holocaust or distribution of antisemitic materials in some countries).

Criminal acts are antisemitic when the targets of attacks, whether they are people or property—such as buildings, schools, places of worship and cemeteries—are selected because they are, or are perceived to be, Jewish or linked to Jews.

Antisemitic discrimination is the denial to Jews of opportunities or services available to others and is illegal in many countries.

Now, as noted, this official U.S. government document is all-encompassing and includes (as “anti-Semitism”) many opinions held by people who are not necessarily anti-Semitic or who do not believe themselves to be anti-Semitic. But this is the definition that throws millions—billions—of people worldwide into the briar patch of “anti-Semitism.”

But not all people across the globe are so easily intimidated by accusations of anti-Semitism. In that regard, note that in 2004 when I was scheduled to lecture before an assembly convened at the national office in Kuala Lumpur, the capital of Malaysia, of the National Bar Council of Malaysia—that country's equivalent of the American Bar Association—there was an attempt to prevent me from speaking. The council received a telephone call from abroad—not from some concerned Malaysian jurist or attorney—complaining that a known “anti-Semite” was about to speak before the distinguished group.

In fact, at the time I was introduced to speak, the interlocutor noted this was *the first time in the entire history of the council—long known for its contentious independence (even in the face of sometimes authoritarian attitudes on the part of the government)—that anyone had tried to censor a scheduled speaker before the council.* The interlocutor, Tommy Thomas—a prominent attorney—commented wryly that “It appears that Mr. Michael Collins Piper—our guest today—has imported the Jewish virus from America.” A dubious distinction indeed.

So, in the end, censorship and lies and bullying and double standards do apply when it comes to discussion of these matters. And no matter how much people protest—saying that they are “only anti-Zionist” and “not anti-Semitic,” they still face the prospect of being included among those tarred with the infamous label.

Jewish American author Gerald Krefetz in his work *Jews & Money: The Myths & the Reality*—no, not an anti-Semitic work issued by “an obscure pro-Nazi publishing house” or some “Islamofascist fundamentalist terrorist group”—put the matter of the issue of Judaism vs. Zionism in perspective when he wrote:

Perhaps it is possible to separate Jewish interests from Israeli interests, but the trick is yet to be turned. What touches Israel touches global Jewry, and vice versa. Purists and theoreticians may argue about the separation of church and state, Jews and Israelis, Judaism and Zionism, but in the real world the connection is hard, fast, and seemingly indivisible.

In short, let it be said that while we can draw lines of separation between the government of Israel itself and of the people of Israel, not to mention the line between the Israeli government and its people versus the Jewish Lobby in America (just as we can say that not all Jews in America support the Jewish Lobby), the fact is that Israel and the Jews worldwide (and in America) are virtually inseparable in the bigger picture. And the never-ending (it seems) cry of “anti-Semitism” pervades the debate—worldwide—as peoples rise up in concern about the activities of Israel and its lobby in America.

Ironically, even the term “anti-Semitism” is essentially a stolen good—just as the land of Palestine was stolen from the native Christian and Muslim Arabs. As many Arabs (and others) rightly rush to point out, Arabs are truly Semites.

Yet the term “anti-Semitism” has been hijacked and is now used exclusively by the Jews—and those who promote the Jewish Agenda—as part of their propaganda rhetoric, defining the term to mean what it now does mean (correctly or not) in the public mind.

And what the public thinks (and what the power brokers say is the truth, even if it is not) is what—unfortunately—means something in our “dumbed down” world of today.

So while it is the job of the truth-seekers and those who demand justice for the oppressed people of Palestine to fight to separate the facts from the myths and to set the record straight—no simple task—the fact remains that correcting the misuse of the term “anti-Semitism” (at least for now) is going to be one of the biggest battles that must be fought, for, as we’ve seen, the term “anti-Semitism” and the label “anti-Semitic” is at the very foundation of the drive to establish the New World Order.

With all of that having been said, let us proceed and examine just why what I have written and said has led me to be labeled an “anti-Semite”—whether rightly or not.

If I can promise you anything, it's this:

The last thirty years—even more—have been an interesting journey for me and I think my recollections of it will be for you as well, no matter how intellectually or emotionally uncomfortable the process may be. If you're ready to fight the New World Order, let's do it . . .

CHAPTER ONE

Are the so-called “anti-Semites” really paranoid, unstable, unsophisticated?

The tendency to dismiss anti-Semitism as a bizarre hallucination, a fantasy of diseased minds, is undoubtedly justified in some instances but has also often been overdone and has thus hindered understanding, for Jews have been disliked for many reasons by a very wide variety of normal people, many of whom were neither emotionally unstable nor intellectually unsophisticated, and a few of whom were . . . of great ability (Wagner, Barres, or T. S. Eliot, for example).

It is far too easy, indeed, too reassuring, to describe anti-Semites as mentally deranged or morally flawed in all regards. The extent to which anti-Semitism was “normal” requires . . . a more serious and open-minded investigation. . . .

Not all hostility to Jews, individually or collectively, has been based on fantastic or chimerical visions of them, or on projections unrelated to any palpable reality.

—Albert Lindemann of the University of California at Santa Barbara, writing in *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*, published by Cambridge University Press, 2000

It must be recognized, as it rarely is in histories of the Jews, that [the] expressed resentments and indictments against the Jews were not entirely fictitious libels or maliciously revived and activated stereotypes simply disseminated by paranoid hate merchants from the grab bag of the anti-Semitic pre-modern past. There was just enough empirical truth in these negative, overblown, and over-generated images to give them persuasive force.

—Dr. Norman Cantor of New York University, writing in *The Sacred Chain: The History of the Jews*, published by HarperCollins, 1995

I play the Bruce harp. . . . It used to be called the Jew's harp. But you know how those people are. The slightest hint of anti-Semitism and they write letters.

—Woody Allen as “Sid Waterman” in his 2006 film *Scoop*.

If “They” Say I’m an “Anti-Semite,” Well, Then, It Must Be True . . .

Writing in the December 21, 2001 edition of *The Independent*, one of Britain's famed social critics, columnist Deborah Orr, proclaimed, “I’m fed up being called an anti-Semite,” in a rather provocative commentary with that title.

A nice traditional liberal—certainly no “Nazi apologist” or “Holocaust Denier” or any such thing—Orr had found herself under fire—as so many have—for daring to criticize the state of Israel.

Orr's accuser was no less than distinguished Canadian-based columnist Barbara Amiel, who took umbrage with the fact Orr had said that the French ambassador to Britain was within his rights of referring to Israel as a “shitty little country.” The ambassador also said that Israel might well touch off a third world war as a consequence of its antics—a point many sensible and civilized people (who are not “Nazis”) do agree with.

Orr noted that she (Orr) had visited Israel and found that, well, it was not exactly the nicest place in the world, despite everything said otherwise. Reflecting on the criticism from Amiel, Orr wrote:

Whoops! Now, I stand accused of both anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism, which we are constantly, patiently, told are exactly the same thing. No they're not. They're two different things.

Anti-Semitism is disliking all Jews, anywhere, and anti-Zionism is just disliking the existence of Israel and opposing those who support it. . . .

There is some truly repulsive and scary anti-Semitism out there, and it is growing. It is frightening to right-thinking Jew and right-thinking gentile alike.

But paranoia must be avoided. . . . Actually, I'm getting fed up with being called an anti-Semite. And the more fed up I get, the more anti-Semitic I sound.

If the likes of Ms Amiel continue to insist that everyone with a word to say against Israel is an anti-Semite, she is going to find one day that the world is once more divided neatly between anti-Semites and Jews.

That sounds like an anti-Semitic threat. It's not. It's the last thing I want.

However, potential, but conditional, sympathizers are alienated so much by Zionist rhetoric that they start singing from what sounds like the same songsheet as the anti-Semite conspiracy theorists.

Now Deborah Orr, as we well know, hardly stands alone in being called an "anti-Semite" for one reason or another. The list of individuals, organizations, institutions, nations, peoples—you name it—victimized by that accusation (which, in some respects, is even more damaging than being charged with pedophilia) is beyond comprehension.

In the opening pages of this volume, we provided the names of just a handful of prominent American political and military figures of recent times who've been slammed with the charge, not to mention some other big figures (past and present) in the fields of art and literature who've also been suspected (rightly or wrongly, as the case may be) of harboring nasty thoughts about "God's Chosen People."

(And in an appendix we've provided an even more comprehensive listing, thoughtfully prepared by some diligent researcher who posted his extraordinarily extended findings on the Internet.)

The names of those accused of being anti-Semites are a virtual gallery of some of the most respected, most talented, most ingenious, most creative, most thoughtful individuals ever to grace the planet Earth. *So those accused of being anti-Semites are in some pretty respectable company, any way you balance the scales.*

And although, as I pointed out, some of my friends and associates cautioned me against publishing this book under the title which it bears, the bottom line sad truth is that—even if one is not truly an "anti-Semite"—once that charge has been levelled against an individual, that label sticks. It's an indelible stain that won't go away.

So let it be said right up front—we'll get this dirty business out of the way before we go any further—that the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, the number one organization in America—if not the world—that portrays itself as the leader in "the fight against anti-Semitism" has asserted more than once (over a period of some three decades) that I—Michael Collins Piper—am an "anti-Semite" or otherwise associated with some of the most notorious "anti-Semites" operating on the face of the planet today.

Well, if the ADL says it, it must be true. After all, the ADL is hailed by the mass media as one of the foremost civil rights organizations anywhere. It is regularly promoted in the pages of the biggest newspapers and magazines and its spokesmen, such as Abraham Foxman are very much celebrities, appearing prominently on television and radio.

Now inasmuch as the ADL will be, not surprisingly, often referenced in these pages, it's appropriate to tell you now what the ADL *really* is: It is the nation's most powerful private Jewish spy and disinformation organization, funded by Jewish billionaires and Jewish organized crime figures. A well-financed propaganda, public relations and intelligence

arm of Israel's covert operations and assassinations service, the Mossad, the ADL has a long history of attacking people of all races, creeds and colors who have dared to challenge the power of the Jewish lobby over America's political process.

So then, who am I to argue with the ADL?

Seriously now: I could scream to high heaven at the top of my voice: "I am not an anti-Semite," and the ADL would respond: "Anti-Semites always deny that they are anti-Semites, but their actions speak louder than their words."

I could proclaim, "Oh, no, I'm not an anti-Semite, I'm just a critic of Israel," and the ADL would proclaim, "Well, anti-Semites always mask their intentions by saying that they are just critics of Israel."

And as we shall see, it is now presumably an established article of faith that even being critical of Israel is, in fact, anti-Semitism.

The truth is that you are damned if you do and damned if you don't when it comes to the matter of discussing issues which touch on either Jewish political concerns in general or the matter of the state of Israel specifically.

And to be perfectly candid, over the years I have given up arguing the point. My work—in writing and as a broadcaster—has focused on the subject of the immense Jewish political presence in America and the negative manner in which it has misdirected U.S. foreign policy.

As such, inevitably, I've come to the conclusion that all I can do is to continue to speak out—loudly and proudly—and express my beliefs and concerns and ignore the catcalls and the brickbats from the ADL and its assorted allies at work in America today.

To be honest, I don't care if they do call me an "anti-Semite." I say what I believe and I believe what I say and I try to document the foundation for what I believe—the ADL's criticisms be damned.

Just for the record—in the context of this volume—here are some selections from the ADL (posted on its website) about my various endeavors of recent years:

According to the Zayed Center Web Site, the American Anti-Semite Michael Collins Piper presented a lecture in which he claimed that the Jewish conspiracies for world domination described in The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, the infamous anti-Semitic forgery, are "not a theory but a real fact."

He described President Bush's policies as deriving from his "Christian fundamentalism" and the President himself as a "classic fanatic Zionist." He also claimed that Israel is developing an "ethnic bomb" that will "eliminate the whole Arab race."

Piper elaborated on the classic canard of Jewish/Zionist control of the American media and government, and claimed that Israel and the Mossad were responsible for the assassination of John F. Kennedy, the Watergate scandal, and the Monica Lewinsky affair.

**—ADL Backgrounder: The Zayed Center
March 11, 2003**

In this case, the ADL lied—no real surprise.

I did not mention the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion in my lecture. Rather, in response to a question from the audience afterward, asking for my comments about the Protocols, I pointed out that there has long been a historic controversy surrounding their origins and that I have seen convincing arguments both pro- and con- regarding their validity. And the literature on both sides is endless.

Noting that an American researcher of my acquaintance had found a report in a London-based Jewish journal (published in the 1920s) asserting that the Protocols were the work of *a faction* at one of the early Zionist congresses, I pointed out that it was entirely possible that the Protocols (as we know them) may have been based on previous works (of non-Jewish origin) as critics of the Protocols have asserted.

And if that is true, that would mean, of course, that the Protocols are not so much an anti-Semitic “forgery” as they are often called, but actually, instead, “stolen goods”—pirated writings, objects of plagiarism—appropriated by Jewish intriguers who saw some value in the writings of Maurice Joly or one of a number of others who are said by Jewish critics of the Protocols to be the real originators of the fiendish texts we see (and hear about almost daily in the media) today!

In addition, the ADL failed to mention that the anti-Arab “ethnic bomb” which the ADL said that I “claimed” Israel was developing was not something dreamed up by yours truly.

In fact, as I noted in my lecture, my source on this matter was an article published on the front page of *The London Sunday Times*—not known to be a Ku Klux Klan journal—on November 15, 1998 under the title “Israel Planning ‘Ethnic Bomb’ as Saddam Caves In.”

A co-author of the article was cited as “Uzi Mahnaimi”—and “Uzi” happens to be a distinctly Jewish and Israeli name. But the ADL would have people believe that I was conjuring up bizarre—almost science-fiction-like—conspiracy theories.

So much then for what the ADL said about my lecture in Abu Dhabi (the text of which appears in this volume, beginning on page 237).

And here's more of what the ADL has said about me, some of it true, some of it a twist on reality, but all dedicated to theme that I am guilty of practicing and promulgating the utmost degree of repugnant moral turpitude in the form of what the ADL calls “anti-Semitism”:

A recent conference in Austin, Texas, has provided evidence of prominent anti-Semites attempting to exploit growing interest in the United States in anti-government conspiracy theories, and to use this interest as a way to spread hatred against Jews. . . .

Speakers at the conference moved easily back and forth between anti-Semitic and anti-government rhetoric. They spouted conspiracy theories about Jews controlling the media and banking system and promoted anti-government conspiracy theories questioning the legitimacy of the Federal Reserve and the Obama administration. . . .

However, most of the vitriol directed at Jews came from two prominent anti-Semites: long-time AFP writer Michael Collins Piper and conspiracy preacher Texe Marrs.

Piper, who labeled his talk “Why the Fight Against the Jewish Zionist Power is the Central Political Issue of Our Time,” claimed that Jews control the media, money and politics in the United States.

He further asserted that it is Jews, not the United Nations, who threaten to establish a “New World Order” in this country. Anti-government extremists often claim the United Nations is trying to enslave American citizens by establishing a tyrannical one-world government they refer to as the New World Order.

Piper has a long history of promoting anti-Semitic conspiracy theories, and his 1994 book *Final Judgment* accused the Mossad and various Jews of carrying out the Kennedy assassination. During his speech, Piper displayed and praised anti-Semitic tracts from Europe, one reportedly dating from the early 19th century, which demonized Jews and Judaism.

**—Anti-Semites Exploit
Anti-Government Sentiment
April 13, 2010**

Texe Marrs—described demeaningly as a “conspiracy preacher” by the ADL—is one of the most forthright Christian evangelists exposing Zionism today. I have valued his friendship and that of his wife Wanda

and the good people on the staff at his ministry. His wide-ranging body of work can be found at powerofprophecy.com and is recommended to all people of good faith.

The ADL's rampage against yours truly continues:

The Iranian Foreign ministry extended invitations to Holocaust deniers and anti-Semites from around the world in convening their Holocaust denial conference, "Review of the Holocaust: Global Vision."

The following is a sampling of those haters and others who accepted the invitation to present their views during the December 11-12 sessions in Tehran.

A reporter for the *American Free Press*, a conspiracy-oriented, anti-Semitic publication published by Willis Carto, Michael Collins Piper has written several books promoting anti-Semitic conspiracy theories, including claims the Mossad was involved in the John F. Kennedy assassination, and that Israel and the American pro-Israel lobby control U.S. foreign policy.

He also claims Israel was implicated in the events of 9-11. In 2003, he lectured on anti-Israel and anti-Semitic themes (including the alleged truth of The Protocols of the Elders of Zion) in the United Arab Emirates at the invitation of the now-defunct Zayed Center.

**—Iran Hosts Anti-Semitic Hatefest
Attendees: A Who's Who of Hate
December 14, 2006**

Again—that ADL lie about my comments on the Protocols! But, of course, there's much much more in the ADL's smorgasbord of hatred:

In an October 20, 2008 article in the *American Free Press*, an anti-Semitic conspiracy-oriented newspaper that also appears online, Michael Collins Piper accused Jews of being the biggest threat to America and of purposely "pillaging" the American people. He declared that "their crimes constitute treason and they should be treated as the traitors they are."

**—Financial Crisis Sparks
Wave of Internet Anti-Semitism,
Stereotypes of Jewish Greed
October 2, 2008**

And yet again, the ADL lied. My article in question—which accurately described Wall Street piracy—never used the term "Jews" nor did it ever claim they were "the biggest threat to America." But truth was never part of the ADL's agenda. And one more:

In January 2002, [David] Duke attended an extremist conference in Moscow organized by Willis Carto [Michael Collins Piper's longtime employer]. The conference focused on Holocaust denial and resolved that Zionism "aspires to establish world supremacy" and attempts to "destroy morality, national culture...and security of the nations" of the world. It was attended by other well-known American anti-Semites such as Michael Collins Piper and Russell Granata, as well as European Holocaust deniers such as Juergen Graf.

**—White Supremacist David Duke Invited
to Give Anti-Semitic Lectures in Bahrain
November 14, 2002**

Perhaps I should be flattered that the ADL found me to be "well-known" among such distinguished company. But this is a flavor, a sampling, of what has been written about me (publicly, at any rate) by what is said to be the most prestigious Jewish organization in America.

But the ADL is not the only troublesome group that has taken shots at me. On Sept. 13, 2002, the self-styled Middle East Media Research Institute (MEMRI) issued a special report entitled "The Events of September 11 and the Arab Media: The New Anti-Semitic Myth" levelling an attack on a bevy of journalists (including yours truly) who have raised questions about likely Israeli foreknowledge (and/or culpability) in the tragic events of September 11.

The aforementioned MEMRI, it should be noted, was founded by Yigal Carmon, a former colonel in the Israeli Defense Forces intelligence division, counterterrorism advisor to two Israeli prime ministers, and acting head and advisor in the office of the civil division of Arab Affairs administration in the occupied West Bank and Gaza. The latter post, by the way, would have placed Carmon in the effective position of being the modern-day equivalent of one of the German SS officers who oversaw Jewish affairs in the Warsaw ghetto or in one of the famed concentration camps of World War II infamy.

That having been said, though, I would be remiss, at this juncture, if I failed to advise you—again for the record—what even the government of Israel has said about me in an official pronouncement.

In the spring of 2007, an Israeli state agency known as the Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism (CFCA) announced the inauguration of a so-called "Hall of Shame." Co-sponsors of this Hall of Shame were the office of the Israeli prime minister, Israel's education and foreign ministries, the Anti-Defamation League, the World Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith and the Jewish Agency, among others.

Inducted into the Hall of Shame—a virtual "hit list"—were some 60 researchers and academics from 30 nations worldwide. Those awarded the "honor" were targeted because they were speakers at a well-attended conference held in Teheran, Iran on December 11-12, 2006 under the auspices of the Iranian Foreign Ministry's Institute for Political and International Studies. My name—Michael Collins Piper—is in that "Hall of Shame," for I was at the conference, representing the Washington, D.C.-based journal, *The Barnes Review*, and its publisher, Willis A. Carto.*

* The "Hall of Shame" list was as follows: Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (Iran); Manouchehr Mohammadi (Iran); Manouchehr Mottaki (Iran); Mohtashamipour (Iran); Robert Faurisson (France); Fredrick Töben (Australia); David Duke (USA); Christian Lindner (Denmark); Shiraz Dossa (Canada); Michele Renouf (United Kingdom); Richard Krege (Australia); Peter Töpfer (Germany); Mohammad Ali Ramin (Iran); Bradley R Smith (Mexico); Mohammad Hegazi (Australia); Michael Collins Piper (USA); Alexander Baron (United Kingdom); Bernard Schaub (Switzerland); Herbert Schaller (Austria); Georges Theil (France); Jan Bernhoff (Sweden); Patrick McNalley (Japan); Golanreza Vatandost (Iran); Nadin Ravski (Russia); Matthias Chang (Malaysia); George Kadar (Hungary); Hans Gamlich (Austria); Wolfgang Fröhlich (Austria); Gazi Hussein (Syria); Aghaqhosseini (Iran); Abuzied Edrisi (Morocco); Alfonso Pengas (Greece); T. Boshe (Jordan); Torjanzadeh (Tajikistan); Rahmandost (Iran); Dr. Mousavi (Iran); Carsten Bormann (Germany); Flávio Consalves (Portugal); Benedikt Frings (Germany); Moshe Friedman (Austria); Yisroel Weiss (USA); Zaryani Abdurrahman (Malaysia); NDiaye Alassane-Salif (Ivory Coast); Serge Thion (France); Herbert Hoff (Germany); Jean Faurisson (France); Tareq-Ahmed (Bahrain); Yeshaye Rosenberg (USA); Leonardo Clerici (Belgium); Mohammad Mansour Nejad (Iran); Mohammed Mojtaba Khan (India); M Al Rousan (Jordan); Hossein Harsich (Iran); Mr Mosleh Zadeh (Iran); Mr Ghaderi (Iran); Majid Ghodarzi (Iran); Mohammad Tarahi (Iran); Dr Mohammadi (Iran); Veronica Clark (USA); Moshe Ayre Friedman (Austria); Arnold Cohen (United Kingdom); David Irving (United Kingdom).

Note that for reasons known only to the Israeli propagandists who prepared this "Hall of Shame"—which was said to reflect the participants in the Iran conference—the name of British historian David Irving was actually at the *beginning* of the list. In fact, at the time, Irving was still being held in prison on Austria where he was serving a criminal sentence for the "crime" of "Holocaust denial." However, the good news that Irving was finally released from prison came just days after the conference concluded. So, in many respects, Irving was in attendance at the conference, if in spirit only.

Entitled "Review of the Holocaust: Global Vision," the conference (described in further detail in Chapter Twenty-Three) received worldwide media attention which cast the gathering as an utterly infamous event, one made more so by the fact that Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad saluted the conference participants at a special closing event, this at a time when Dr. Ahmadinejad had already been designated as Arch-Villain Number One by the mass media in America and Israel.

Although my publisher, Willis Carto, was unable to attend, he took special delight in the fact the conference had been convened: It was actually the culmination of many years work by Carto (going back, in his case, to the mid-1950s) accompanied by a small—but ever-growing—group of academics and intellectuals, known as the Revisionists, who had begun to raise serious questions about what did—and did not—happen during the period we remember today as "the Holocaust."

In fact, it was Carto—soon to become the world's largest publisher and distributor of Revisionist literature—who organized (in 1979) the first-ever international conference focusing on the work of those making inquiries into the facts about "the Holocaust." And in the years that followed, stimulated by the work of Carto and like-minded colleagues, Holocaust Revisionism became a global phenomenon.

For more than 50 years Carto has been a front-line target of those obsessed with Anti-Semitism. And I've been pleased to be associated with him and his work.

Now, those who have decided they are the ultimate arbiters of "who's an anti-Semite and who isn't" have issued their ruling. It's official. Michael Collins Piper is an anti-Semite. And so it is.

No matter how much I protest that I have Jewish friends (which I do), I will be tarred as an anti-Semite. No matter how often I praise the contributions of Jewish artists, writers, entertainers and others (which I do), I will be forever remembered as an anti-Semite. No matter how many times I reach out to Jewish people to join me in fighting war and imperialism (which I do), I will always be slandered as an anti-Semite.

And as I have frankly said time and again, "If criticizing Israel and if challenging the power of the Jewish lobby and the Jewish-dominated mass media in America makes me an anti-Semite, then I am proud to say, in no uncertain terms, that I am indeed an anti-Semite."

But in the meantime, please keep in mind that you—too—may be subject to being called an "anti-Semite," even if you don't believe yourself to be just that. Even if you've never dared talk about the Holocaust in ways that Jewish people find objectionable. Even if you say you're just a critic of Israel—not of Jews as Jews. You still may be dubbed an "anti-Semite" and marked for life. So, then, let us proceed . . .



An image from the British journal *Puck* (circa 1880). A bloated, arrogant Jewish “swell” struts on Broadway in New York, surrounded by scenes of anti-Jewish events in European history, including the banishment of the Jews from France and Spain and restrictions against corrupt and predatory Jewish financial practices instituted in other civilized societies. The outline under the image reads: “They Are the People. The Downtrodden One. They Have Always Persecuted Us, But We Get There All the Same!” The image below illustrates the expulsion of the Jews from St. Petersburg, Russia and the beginning of the journey for many of them to Western Europe, the United States and Palestine. This expulsion—like those in so many countries—came about as a popular response to what were perceived to be nefarious activities by the Jewish people as a group.



CHAPTER TWO

Not Just Bigots, Cranks and Criminal Hoodlums: What Is This Thing Called “Anti-Semitism” and Why Has It Run Rampant Throughout History?

Why? Why the persistent continuity of anti-Semitism, from ancient and agricultural Egypt to splendorous and militaristic Rome on to classless and scientifically Marxist Moscow?

And in all the way-stations in between, in time and space, like some perennial poison flower . . . Why is anti-Semitism so ubiquitous and perennial?

Why did Egyptians along the Nile, Americans along the Mississippi, dimeless thugs in Berlin and fatcats in posh country clubs, rich, poor, and middle classes, Black and White, male and female, children and grandparents, churchgoers and atheists, the lettered and the unlettered, the Left and the Right, not infrequently have in common one thing—their amenability to anti-Semitism?

These were the provocative questions rightly posed by Nathan and Ruth Perlmutter in their book *The Real Anti-Semitism in America* (published by Arbor House in 1982). Mr. Perlmutter was well-positioned to raise such questions. The former national associate director of the American Jewish Committee, Perlmutter was then serving as national director of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith, that much-touted organization that paints itself as a foremost authority on anti-Semitism.

The Perlmutter’s point out that there have been untold studies of “why anti-Semitism?” adding that “the total pages of which, laid end to end, would extend from Nuremberg to Jerusalem and back.”

In fact, more recent estimates suggest that there are at least 40,000 books that have been written on the topic of anti-Semitism. So it is obviously a subject that the publishing industry—which, of course, has long been dominated by Jews—wants to keep in the forefront of public discussion, whether the public is interested in the topic or not.

Now—in this volume—as we consider this question of anti-Semitism and ponder its nature—particularly the mindset of those accused of being anti-Semites, it is rather intriguing to recall what a contributor to *Anti-Semitism: An Historical Encyclopedia of Prejudice and Persecution* wrote about Alma Mahler Gropius Werfel, the great Viennese-born

beauty—said to be the most famous muse of the 20th Century—who was married to three monumental composers, Gustave Mahler, Walter Gropius, and Franz Werfel.

Although Mahler and Werfel were Jewish, the encyclopedia asserts that Alma—who died in Los Angeles in 1964 (still a celebrated figure in her own right)—was an anti-Semite.

And that point—if true, and we have no reason to believe otherwise—is very interesting. And it raises so many questions that we would be hard pressed to attempt to provide the answers here.

However, it demonstrates that anti-Semites—however defined—come in all shapes and kinds and often under the most unusual circumstances (particularly in the case of Alma the Muse, to say the least).

So considering the ancient conflict between the Jew and the Gentile, we may simply refer to the reflections about the differences between these peoples in their outlook toward one another as expressed in the words of one of most powerful Jews in the world today: Edgar Bronfman, longtime head of the World Jewish Congress and reigning billionaire patriarch of the Jewish crime syndicate family that assembled its fortune during Prohibition and which has now breached out into the media, real estate, finance and industry, having officially “gone legit.”

In an interview with Jewish writer Abigail Pogrebin, memorialized in her book, *Stars of David: Prominent Jews Talk About Being Jewish*, Bronfman candidly remarked:

You go to any room, even in New York, because it's probably the most cosmopolitan city in the world—especially for Jews—and at a party you'll see the Jews on one side and the non-Jews on the other.

I think it's an old habit of self-protection; it's also that they have more to talk about with other Jews than non-Jews. It's the herding instinct; you want to be with your own people. As bad as they are sometimes, you know them.

In short, Bronfman was saying—with brutal honesty—that Jews and non-Jews are different. Now while that concept is most certainly one that would offend nice liberal folks who cherish the legend that “everybody's alike,” Bronfman's honesty is commendable.

If a person perceived to be an “anti-Semite” made such remarks, those comments would be pointed out as “evidence” of that individual's anti-Semitic insanity. And if a person not theretofore perceived to be anti-Semitic made such remarks, they would soon be designated as anti-Semitic by those who make it their responsibility to identify anti-Semites.

In the end, it all comes down to the “given” that it is the Jews who are allowed to speak freely about such matters, but non-Jews who dare to address the differences between Jews and Gentiles are simply not permitted to do so. If they do, they suffer the most grievous consequences.

So the truth is that Jews and non-Jews *are* different and the Jews themselves, in their own writings—as we'll see in much greater detail in the pages of this volume—are the first to profess that point, although it is not something that they generally wish to acknowledge to non-Jews who are told repeatedly and with insistence that “all people are the same” and that to suggest that Jews are different is not a nice thing to say. Why, after all, isn't that what Hitler said?

Edgar Bronfman's comments, in a certain sense, recall an old joke to the effect that the definition of “kike”—a derogatory term aimed at Jewish people—is “the Jewish gentleman who just left the room.”

Once I related that joke to a Jewish friend who laughed and said, “That's actually pretty good,” for he recognized the deeper meaning of the joke, beyond its nasty implications: the idea that Jews and Gentiles are, on the whole, for better or worse, ever-conscious of their historic and deep-rooted differences.

(And, by the way, for those offended by the term “kike” note that many linguistic historians have noted that the term “kike” is actually of Jewish origin! Because the names of so many Russian Jewish immigrants ended with “ki,” German Jews who were already well established in America first called the Russian Jews “kikes.” So you can't blame *that* nasty term on those bad old anti-Semites!)

During my conversation with the aforementioned Jewish gentleman—which exchange, in fact, dealt with the differences between Jews and Gentiles—I also told this gentleman about what had happened at the time he had first been introduced to me on the street on Capitol Hill in Washington: Just a moment after this Jewish chap had departed, the person who had made the introduction—someone who really had no particular interest in matters Jewish—turned to me and said, in a quiet tone but quite matter-of-factly: “He's a Jew.”

When my Jewish pal heard that story, he laughed, and said, “Well, he was right.” And I said to him, “Well, just like the Jews wonder about who is Jewish and who is not, we Goyim do the same.”

To this day, my Jewish friend greets me in the street by saying, “Hello Coy.” Why “coy”? It turns out that an old Jewish lady of his longtime acquaintance, pronounced the word “Goy” (the Jewish term of derision for non-Jews) with a hard “c” rather than a hard “g.”

Now these personal anecdotes from my own experience, having candid discussions of the subject of anti-Semitism with a Jewish friend

are just that: personal. But they do underscore the truth in Edgar Bronfman's comments above. So I think it's accurate to say that "anti-Semitism" (however defined) has its bottom line in the very real differences that do exist between the Jews and non-Jews.

All of this is not to suggest that all non-Jews are necessarily "anti-Semitic" or even inclined that way, despite the fact that very real anti-Semitism has been a potent force in many nations and cultures, even in places such as Japan, for example, where there really are very few Jews. And what's more, although most people have probably never considered it, while we always hear so much about "anti" when it comes to the Jews, the truth is that there are many numbers of folks who are actually very much "pro" when it comes to the Jews.

In fact, a recognized Jewish authority on anti-Semitism, Jerome Chanes, has said that there are three types of people: "Philo-Semites, Non-Anti-Semites, and Anti-Semites." And noting in a footnote to this assertion, Chanes added cryptically, "The Philo-Semitism Phenomenon is a social-psychological phenomenon that calls for a discreet study."

Consider Chanes' words: "the Philo-Semitism Phenomenon." He deems it a "phenomenon" worth the time and money for a "discreet study." So while Jewish think tanks may be quietly spending untold sums to monitor "Philo-Semitism," it is unlikely the Anti-Defamation League (which rakes in millions of dollars by stirring up fears of anti-Semitism and promising to fight it) will ever issue a missive praising its Philo-Semitic friends. For, after all, that would ruin the whole game.

(By the way, Chanes—who is on the faculty of Brandeis University's Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies—made his comments in an essay entitled "America Is Different! Myths and Realities in the Study of Anti-Semitism in the United States," appearing in *Not Your Father's Anti-Semitism: Hatred of the Jews in the 21st Century*, edited by Michael Berenbaum and published in 2008 by Paragon House.)

So there *is* something called anti-Semitism and there are many people in places high and low who have been charged with being anti-Semitic since time immemorial. *And* there are Philo-Semites too!

One recent (and rather hysterical) definition of anti-Semitism (aiming such charges against some very distinguished people) came from the pen of influential Jewish academic and military strategist Eliot Cohen, writing in the April 5, 2006 edition of *The Washington Post*.

Referring to the then-recently published (and highly "controversial") paper by two well-known and undeniably respected (at least until then) American scholars, John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, first appearing in *The London Review of Books* and later released in book form under the title *The Israel Lobby*, Cohen wrote:

If by anti-Semitism one means obsessive and irrationally hostile beliefs about Jews; if one accuses them of disloyalty, subversion, or treachery, of having occult powers and of participating in secret combinations that manipulate institutions and governments; if one systematically selects everything unfair, ugly or wrong about Jews as individuals or as a group and equally systematically suppresses any exculpatory information—why, yes, this paper is anti-Semitic.

Now the fact that this definition is coming from Eliot Cohen is one that needs to be considered carefully, for when Eliot Cohen speaks, to elaborate on an old catchphrase, many powerful people do listen.

A graduate of the Maimonides School—an Orthodox Jewish school in Massachusetts named for the famed Talmudic scholar and ranked as one of the world's foremost Jewish pre-collegiate educational institutions—Cohen received his Ph.D. from Harvard and then went on to a career as a foremost figure in military and geostrategic studies.

From 1982 to 1985, Cohen was an assistant professor of government and assistant dean at Harvard University. Following this, he taught for four years at the Naval War College in the Department of Strategy, before a brief period in 1990 serving on the policy planning staff of the Office of the United States Secretary of Defense.

In 1990, Cohen joined Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies where today (2011) he is the director of strategic studies. He was, however, best known as a prominent front-line operative in the ranks of the Jewish hard-line pro-Israel neo-conservatives who orchestrated the United States into the no-win war in Iraq.

A founding member of the neo-conservative policy group, the Project for the New American Century—famed for its suggestion that America needed a "New Pearl Harbor" in order to jump-start U.S. involvement in new global military ventures—Cohen has enthusiastically referred to the vaunted "war on terrorism" as "World War IV."

Cohen also served, under George W. Bush, as a member of the Defense Policy Board (DPB) Advisory Committee which was hardly more than a nest of Zionist intriguers, many of them (including Cohen) recruited by the DPB's then-chairman, the infamous Richard Perle, a long-time high-ranking figure in Washington policy circles who was investigated (at least once) by the FBI on suspicion of espionage for Israel. From 2007 to 2009, Cohen was a "counselor" to the Department of State.

The point of all this biographical data relating to Cohen is this: he is a very influential figure and his critique of the Mearsheimer-Walt thesis—which was hardly different from anything written by yours truly or by

scores of other independent writers over the years—does indeed reflect an attitude toward “anti-Semitism” that reigns in the upper ranks of the Jewish policy making elite in America.

So when one such as Cohen defines even the relatively harmless—but factual—writings of two prominent American academics as constituting “anti-Semitism,” then we must admit (no matter how hard it may be) that even some of the most respected figures in the academic community are subject to the smear.

And what makes Cohen’s words so remarkable is the fact that Mearsheimer and Walt, in their book and in their subsequent writings and lectures presented in its defense, went to extraordinary lengths to assure anyone who would listen that they were most definitely *not* anti-Semites. But the tar of anti-Semitism had already been brushed upon them and now, for the record, Mearsheimer and Walt *are* “anti-Semites,” whether they like the designation or not.

So while Jewish voices such as Cohen in our modern-day have issued their definition of anti-Semitism, it is probably worth taking a brief journey into the past and glancing at some earlier writings that, in all fairness, can indeed be ranked as the work of individuals who can most correctly be considered “anti-Semites” in what we might call the purest and most unadulterated form. Their rhetoric gives us some basic insight into what some admitted anti-Semites have had to say about the Jews.

In that regard, one of the most remarkable (and genuinely influential) “anti-Semitic” works of all time was *The Handbook of the Jewish Question*, by German writer Theodor Fritsch, first published in 1887. Originally entitled *The Anti-Semitic Catechism*, it had gone through 40 editions by 1936, three years after Fritsch’s death in 1933.

Fritsch himself was known among German National Socialists as “the great old teacher,” in recognition of his writings relating to that controversial subject of Jewish-Gentile relations.

In answering the question, “What are the Jews Really Guilty Of?” here is what Fritsch wrote:

- 1.) Jews engage in usurious dealings with peasants, artisans, officials and officers.
- 2.) Their sharp business practices lead to the decline of honest trade and make it their prey.
- 3.) They ruin handicraft and cause formerly independent artisans to submit to wage slavery.
- 4.) They force wages and prices down to a level where honest labor can hardly exist any longer and the threat of a bloody revolution constantly grows.

5.) They have a monopoly of the press and use it to deceive the people as to the true causes of their misery and to divert discontent toward wrong targets: government, church, junkers, police, officials.

6.) They demoralize the people by feeding them sensational and obscene news, degrading our entire culture.

7.) They committed fraud on a gigantic scale at the time of the financial crash [of 1873].

8.) They influenced legislation through Jewish parliamentarians and through paid non-Jewish underlings, with the aim of furthering their own designs, fraudulent insolvency, gambling at the stock exchange, freedom of movement.

9.) They commercialize all values: offices, titles, prestige, honor, love; causing moral devastation, especially among the nation’s young womanhood. They run the white slave trade.

10.) They have lured into their nets and have bribed many prominent persons. The few men of character who resist are mercilessly slandered in the Jewish press.

11.) They dominate even governments through shrewd financial operations, have pull with all cabinets through international contacts, so that no individual state can dare take steps against the Jews without being set upon by neighboring states.

But despite all of this crime and misdeeds traceable, said Fritsch, to the Jews as a group, Fritsch still said firmly: “Thou shalt use no violence against the Jews, because it is unworthy of thee and against the law. But if a Jew attack thee, ward off his Semitic insolence with German wrath.”

Now, of course, Fritsch may be dismissed by some as one of the god-fathers of German anti-Semitism, as a source of the virulent hatred, as it is described, that led to the Holocaust.

But—with that in mind—consider the writings of Voltaire, the French philosopher of the Enlightenment, one of the great intellects of Western Civilization. He did not write kindly of the Jews:

The Jews boast of having issued from Egypt like a band of robbers, carrying away everything they had borrowed from the Egyptians. They glory in having spared neither age, sex nor infancy in the villages and towns they subdued. . . .

They have the effrontery to display an irreconcilable hatred against other nations—they revolt against all their masters—ever superstitious—ever envious of others’ good—ever barbarous—ever servile in misfortune, and insolent in prosperity.

It is not at all astonishing that the neighboring people should unite against the Jews, who in their eyes could only appear as a band of . . . robbers and depredators; and not as the sacred instruments of divine vengeance and the future salvation of the human race . . .

The Hebrews have ever been vagrants, or robbers, or slaves, or seditious. They are still vagabonds upon the earth, abhorred by men, and yet affirming that Heaven and Earth and all mankind were created for them alone.

And even Theodore Herzl—the founding father of the Zionist movement that gave birth to the Jewish state of Israel—once said that anti-Semites were “fully within their rights.” He wrote that “I took a look at the Paris Jews and saw family likeness in their faces: bold, misshapen noses; furtive and cunning eyes.” Herzl also asserted that “it will be the anti-Semites who will be our staunchest friends and the anti-Semitic countries which will be our allies.” He actually asked for “honest anti-Semites” to support the Zionist movement and indeed many did.

History shows that in many countries persons frankly hostile to the Jewish people lent their support to Zionism precisely because they saw it as the final solution to the Jewish Problem, a means to bid farewell at long last to the Jewish presence in their own particular countries and provide the Jewish people a land in which they, the Jews, could thrive amongst their own, unable to carry out the type of intrigues that the aforementioned Theodor Fritsch assessed to be the Jewish method of operation in dealing with non-Jews.

The fact that the Jewish state of Israel was established through criminal and violent means and illicit methods that dispossessed the native Arab Christians and Muslims is beyond the scope of our immediate discussion—and we will come to that point later—but suffice it to say that today there are many modern-day anti-Semites (who acknowledge themselves to be just that) who argue that despite the existence of Israel, the Jews are not even satisfied with that.

Most genuine anti-Semites argue (as I have noted in my book *The New Babylon*) that Israel is simply one facet of the over-all global Jewish Agenda—in effect, a spiritual homeland, a religious symbol, a geographic expression of Jewish world power—and that, in the end, the real Jewish aim is a global imperium, a Jewish Utopia. That is, the New World Order.

Essentially, what we find, is that those who, throughout history, have risen up to challenge the New World Order have been pinpointed, then, as anti-Semites—and probably correctly so. But the historical record shows that although Jewish sources enjoy telling anyone who will listen

that only those of a lesser breed are “anti-Semites,” the truth is that some very remarkable people have been anti-Semites. That has not stopped Jewish sources from going to extraordinary lengths to portray anti-Semites to the public as bigots, cranks, and criminal hoodlums of a distinctly lower intellect, uneducated, just plain trash.

The purpose of this is to convey the message that anyone who raises a voice against the Jewish agenda is “bad” and “stupid” and this is enough to scare many people (who might be inclined to criticize Jews) from saying anything that could get them labeled stupid!

A notable example of this can be found in the pages of the volume *Anti-Semitism: Myth and Hate From Antiquity to the Present*, published in 2002 by Palgrave MacMillan. The authors—Marvin Perry and Frederick Schweitzer (both presumably Jewish)—typically adopt the traditional Jewish outlook toward farmers—the people of the land.

Their writings—one might call them “writings”—are a perfect example of how the Jews have gone out of their way, beyond the pale, over the top, in their efforts to smear, degrade and defame anyone who has dared to raise a voice in objection to Jewish intrigues.

Talking about Henry Ford, the great American industrialist and his interest in the now-infamous Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, these Jews say that for Ford, the Protocols were “the golden key and the missing link, a flash of confirmation of his farm-bred prejudices and Populist phobias, broadening and deepening and justifying them.”

These Judeo-centric authors fail to note, however, that across the great agricultural prairies of America and throughout the rural “Bible Belt” there are perhaps millions of farm-bred Christians who worship today at the altar of the Jewish people and the state of Israel.

So, turning the tables, critics of Israel and its supporters could very well say that the Judeo-Philes—the Christian Zionists—are actually a product of that same “farm-bred” mentality that the authors are condemning in their dissection of Ford.

These authors go so far as to say that “while [Ford] was a master mechanic with a genius for coordinating production on the assembly line, this uneducated and unread man felt empowered to pronounce oracularly on any and every subject under the sun.”

The vile nature of these remarks is made even more outrageous when one considers the fact that Ford—throughout his career—interacted daily with everyone from laborers to titans of Wall Street and captains of industry and thus had access to a broad range of ideas and attitudes far beyond the “average” man—no matter how little formal education Ford had under his belt, no matter how many books by esteemed Jewish scholars that he had read or not read.

These authors further complain that "given his enormous wealth, as one of the richest men in the world, and his folk hero status as auto wizard and author of the five-dollars-a-day wage, Ford's deliverances were accepted as revealed truth."

The arrogance of this assessment is immense. Henry Ford brought amazing change to American (and world) society through his industrial innovations and the new prosperity he brought to working people. If anyone had a right to comment on the world around him, it was Henry Ford, these contemptible Jewish propagandists be damned.

These authors then reference the point that Ford was once referred to as "a simple man, almost primitive in his general outlook," as though there is something "wrong" with simple folk—those good people all over the planet who do not steep themselves in studying the Talmud, who do not rely on the Jewish-controlled mass media to direct their opinions, who do not make the business of others their business (as the Jewish power elite do so today).

For good measure, these agitators for the Jewish agenda make the claim that Adolf Hitler plagiarized from the works of Henry Ford—a claim that they do not document and an allegation that I have never seen made in all of the many writings regarding Hitler and Ford that I have personally studied over some thirty years.

But then, again, as I have said, when it comes to subjects of Jewish concern, Jewish propagandists have never been known for their veracity if the facts stand in the way of the Jewish agenda. And I say that without reservation.

Two other pro-Jewish propagandists, Harold E. Quinley and Charles Y. Glock, in their 1979 book *Anti-Semitism in America* (published by the Free Press) also take up the "Anti-Semites are uneducated working class bums" cudgel and assert in their screed:

Working class Americans are more anti-Semitic than middle class Americans, the result, largely, of the former's lack of education. . . . A lack of education is the main source of anti-Semitic prejudice in America.

These same authors also say that it could be "anti-Semitic" if people didn't want their children to marry Jews. But we frankly have to wonder how these authors would have responded to the candid admission by much-touted Sen. Joe Lieberman of Connecticut when he was quoted as saying—not long after he was designated as the Democratic Party's vice presidential nominee in 2000—that he would counsel his own Jewish children not to marry outside their faith.

It's a very simple point: if non-Jews say that they don't want their children to marry Jews, well, that is just plain old "anti-Semitism," but when Jews say that they don't want their children to marry Christians, that's just a really wonderful thing. Jews, it is said, are preserving their historic heritage and the legacy of the Jewish people.

In their book, Quinley and Glock even discuss the subject of Christmas carols as if they—Christmas carols—are or could be perceived to be "anti-Semitic." I kid you not.

But then, again, anyone who is familiar with the annual media canonade against Christmas (accompanied by stories of lonely Jews who feel "out of place" among their Christian co-workers at Christmas time) knows that the word "Christmas" is most definitely not to be used at Christmas; rather, it's "Happy Holidays."

When I pointed out to a Greek Orthodox friend—who worships at the altar of the Jewish people—these stories outlined above and noted to him the hypocrisy and double standards on the part on Jews in these matters, he responded—typically—"Oh, all Jews don't say that. You can't stereotype like that."

And so it goes.

But there's a funny final punchline to the story of my Greek friend and his devotion to the Jews. Quite recently he told me—with a bit of a long face—that a woman with whom he works (possibly Jewish—he doesn't know) announced to a gathering at their office that "the Greeks are all anti-Semites." I asked him if he had responded to this stereotyping by this woman and he said, "Well, no." I asked why not. He said, "Well, what she said was pretty much true."

In any case, the aforementioned authors whom we almost lost in our digression—Quinley and Glock—assert that critics of Jewish influence and intrigue are guilty of "extremist politics" which they say results in "a closing down of the democratic marketplace." They claim that "it is the assertion that there is only one 'truth' to be known and acted upon and that other positions are wrong and immoral." They add:

Extremist politics is legitimated by imputing evil motives to one's opponent or adversaries. It portrays the target groups as villains engaged in a conspiracy against the nation's interests and seeks to deny them democratic privileges on this ground.

The irony of their assertion, taken as a whole, is that it precisely mirrors the traditional Jewish tactic used to confront and destroy those who do raise questions about Jewish power politics or who in some way are *perceived* to be a threat to Jewish influence.

The hypocrisy is immense. The Jews want to dominate the "democratic marketplace" and exclude any and all ideas that may be *in some way* adverse to their agenda. And they defame those found guilty of the offense, subject them to boycott, move to block their social, political or economic advancement—the list of hateful (and sometimes violent) tactics goes on and on.

Considering this, can it be any wonder that so many people who were never really "anti-Semitic" have become truly anti-Semitic in response to this kind of behavior by organized Jewish groups and by respected Jewish leaders—none of which groups or leaders ever seem to suffer sanction from the broad numbers of Jewish people.

Although my aforementioned Greek Orthodox friend said that "you can't stereotype like that," the fact is that you can.

If Jews, on the whole, are going to continue to allow their most prominent communal voices to maintain a regular and un-challenged war against the non-Jews in the public arena, then the Jews have only themselves to blame for whatever the consequences.

In response to Jewish agitation, some people write books such as this. Other more energetic folks vandalize synagogues and Jewish cemeteries. Palestinian kids who have seen their homes plowed under by Israeli bulldozers throw rocks—and others commit suicide bombings in Tel Aviv. Some day the state of Israel may be driven into the sea.

It's as simple as that.

In truth, it can be said that, as a people, the Jews suffer from a malady known as pseudologia fantastica. Many people claiming to be victimized are victims of this psychological disability which is related, in some respects, to pathological lying, but which has its own distinct parameters. One summary from authorities at the Department of Psychiatry at the UCLA Neuropsychiatric Institute says that this particular mental illness is typified by the following characteristics:

- (1) the stories [told by those suffering the problem] are not entirely improbable and are often built upon a matrix of truth;
- (2) the stories are enduring;
- (3) the stories are not told for personal profit per se and have a self-aggrandizing quality; and
- (4) they are distinct from delusions in that the person when confronted with facts can acknowledge these falsehoods.

In short, while "anti-Semitism" is very real, much of what the Jewish community as a whole perceives to be anti-Semitism is anything but that. And the record shows—as we'll see, for example, in Chapter Twenty-

Eight—that many supposed acts of anti-Semitism, have been wildly exaggerated (or are simply not true at all). These stories do endure and many of those Jews and others passing on these stories that emerge from the Jewish community genuinely believe them to be true.

And these stories do have a self-aggrandizing quality for the benefit of the Jewish community and for the state of Israel, but it should be noted that, in many instances, Jewish individuals (and others claiming to be Jews when they were not) have made a personal profit from capitalizing on allegations of anti-Semitism.

And, of course, the state of Israel itself has benefited immensely—to the trillions upon trillions of dollars—from "Holocaust" reparations based on calculated numbers of "Jewish dead" that have no foundation in fact.

Finally, as far as the fourth point referenced above is concerned, there have indeed been cases where claimants in the realm of "anti-Semitism" have been confronted with contradictory facts that discount the claims of anti-Semitism and they finally acknowledged their lies.

For example, how many times have we heard stories (even in the mass media, however suppressed those stories largely have been) about Jewish folks claiming to have anti-Semites painting swastikas on their doors, only to have been discovered to have actually painted those swastikas themselves? The numbers of such occurrences are actually much larger than one might imagine.

To be perfectly frank, I have always said (and I have even told my Jewish friends this) that it must really be unpleasant to be a Jew: to wake up in the morning and look in the mirror and wonder who hates you and who you might have to confront as an anti-Semite.

Over the years, I've had the opportunity to review a wide variety of newspapers and magazines published by diverse numbers of ethnic groups in America. And the one thing that I've found consistent in Jewish publications is that the discussion of who Jews hate and who hates the Jews is always rampant.

In contrast, in the journals of other ethnic groups, there is a positive emphasis, a focus on historical and cultural traditions, on the pride of that group's contributions to American life, on the accomplishments of prominent members of those communities. *The Jewish outlook, in contrast, is totally negative and full of anger and distrust.*

There is anti-Semitism, but the Jews seem to want to make it the focus of their past and present and their future and always emphasize that Jews have just simply never done anything wrong. The anti-Semites are just plain bad, and uneducated to boot. But the reality is, as even Jewish sources have quietly admitted, anti-Semites past and present may not exactly be the jack-booted thugs they would have the public believe.

On January 18, 2007 the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum's Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies conducted an entire one-day symposium entitled: "The Holocaust: Cultural Elites, Collaboration, Murder." The quite revealing promotional material for the event read as follows:

Prominent writers, film makers, artists, musicians, clerics, and other intellectuals and cultural elites became willing and even proud proponents of rightist regimes across Europe between the two world wars.

The focus of this symposium is the appeal of National Socialism and fascism to publicly-respected cultural figures and intellectuals in Germany, as well as in Allied, Axis, occupied, and neutral countries in Europe.

So despite all of the hoopla about uneducated, low-life, violent, evil Nazi gangsters taking over Germany in 1933 and imposing their will upon the Germans and the Jews alike, a seminar at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum admitted, in no uncertain terms that "the best and the brightest" (to borrow a popular catchphrase) were among those who lent their support to the Hitler regime—and not at gunpoint.

This, you see, will come as a literal shock to many—Americans, in particular—who've long been led to believe the "official" story that only "bigots, cranks, and criminal hoodlums" have been anti-Semites.

In her fascinating 2003 Harvard University Press study, *The Nazi Conscience*—a review of German National Socialist writings on race and religion and the general Third Reich attitude toward the Jews—Claudia Koonz, professor of history at Duke University, makes the interesting point, little known to the general public, that "professors had been among the most vocal supporters of the Nazi take-over in 1933."

She points out that even the great German Jewish diarist Victor Klemperer, writing in 1936, dreamed of future days in Germany when, as he hoped, "the fate of the vanquished lay in my hands." Klemperer had a particular venom for the intellectuals of Germany. He said that he would "let all the ordinary folk go and even some of the leaders . . . but I would have all the intellectuals strung up and the professors three feet higher than the rest; they would be left hanging from the lamp posts for as long as was compatible with hygiene."

On a more contemporary stage, Gary A. Tobin—director of the Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University—published his 1988 Plenum Press book *Jewish Perceptions of Anti-Semitism* and examined polls relating to anti-Semitism in America, noting that: "Better educated Blacks, younger and better educated evangelicals, and

the younger population in general, are more likely than their less-educated and older counterparts to hold certain anti-Semitic beliefs."

So the idea—generally promulgated to the non-Jewish public by Jewish sources—that the lesser educated tend to be anti-Semitic is not necessarily borne up by the reality of what even studies sponsored by the Jewish community have found. In fact, as we have seen, anti-Semitism is not just limited to the uneducated. It does seem to be something that also comes with a better education and a more broad-ranging worldview.

Actually, we can understand why this would be the case. Better educated people, on the whole, probably tend to spend more time reviewing public affairs (accessing a wide array of sources) and, as a consequence, probably have a better overview of the Jewish role in American and world affairs than the less-educated.

As a direct result, it would seem to be almost inevitable that many such people would be more regularly confronted with Jewish attitudes and opinions—and actions—that do spark genuine "anti-Semitic" points of view. And that may well be why Jewish elements do want to censor the Internet, clamp down on freedom of speech, and do everything they can to "dumb down" non-Jews at large.

Although the Jews, as we've said, attempt to perpetuate the idea that "stupid" people are anti-Semitic—a message they convey to the public on a regular basis—they realize, from their own heavy-duty research, that it is actually the better-educated and more worldly people who have arrived at conclusions about Jewish affairs that the Jewish community would rather not be the conclusions that have been reached.

Incredibly enough, even in Nazi Germany, the 20th Century's much-discussed "cauldron of anti-Semitism," the historical record shows—as recorded by modern Jewish scholars—that the Nazis relied extensively on Jewish writings and philosophy as proof and evidence of the need by the non-Jewish peoples of Europe to take up open opposition to Jewish power and influence.

Contrary to what the Jews tell the public, you see, those Nazi "propagandists" were not creating unpleasant images of the Jewish people and their history out of the whole cloth.

Instead, Nazi researchers were essentially relying on Jewish sources for their own scholarly efforts to assess what then (as now) was called "The Jewish Problem" or "The Jewish Question"—essentially, the whole network of controversy surrounding the issue of anti-Semitism.

For example, in 2006 the Harvard University Press published Jewish researcher Alan E. Steinweis' remarkable work *Studying the Jew: Scholarly Anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany*. A sampling of Steinweis's findings is quite revealing:

Even after the advent of Nazi rule, Jewish scholars continued to produce the majority of historical studies of Jews that appeared in Germany. They published their work with Jewish publishers, who were allowed to operate well after 1933.

Such intellectual and publishing activity among German Jews was consistent with a Nazi policy that promoted the separation of Jews from German society.

Despite the immigration of many scholars, and despite having to operate under the watchful eye of the Gestapo, Jewish academic institutions carried their work forward after 1933. Three rabbinical seminars—two in Berlin and one in Breslau—remained open until November 1938.

The Academy for the Science of Judaism in Berlin, the single most important center of Jewish learning in Germany, employed a faculty of 22 scholars in 1938.

The Nazi regime severely curtailed the activities of Jewish cultural and intellectual institutions after the November 1938 "kristallnacht" pogrom, although the [previously-mentioned Academy for the Science of Judaism] in Berlin was allowed to function until 1942.

And note the years of flourishing Jewish scholarly enterprises mentioned: 1933, 1938 and 1942.

These are years in which the general public believes that the Third Reich was rounding up, shooting, gassing and generally terrorizing the Jews of Germany.

Steinweis admits in his book that German scholars, studying the Jewish people—from an obviously "anti-Semitic" point of view—did indeed rely on the work of Jewish scholars and he noted, in all candor, that "We must still grapple with the disturbing question of whether Nazi Jewish research, or at least some of it, could be considered legitimate scholarship, despite its repugnant ideological basis."

And while the Jews would have the public believe that most of what the Nazis relayed to the German public and the world at large about the Jews was largely distilled from the much-discussed so-called "infamous forgery" known as the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, Steinweis admits also that "relatively little of this perverse fare was present in Nazi Jewish studies."

Having thoroughly examined vast realms of Nazi-era writings on The Jewish Question, Steinweis freely asserts that the hallmark of Nazi Jewish studies was its exploitation of *voluminous scholarship produced by Jewish scholars past and present*. He noted:

The [Nazi] scholars who pursued the new anti-Semitic sciences took their roles as professional academics seriously, seeking to anchor their anti-Semitic research and writing in the established or emerging methodologies of their [particular academic] disciplines.

In the field of race science, they endeavored to identify genetic, and not merely anthropological, markers from Jewishness.

In the field of religious studies, they tried to augment traditional Christian theological critiques of Judaism within insights into the psychological and sociological consequences of Jewish religious and legal practices.

In the field of history, they worked in the archives to reconstruct, in detail, the nature of Jewish-Christian relations in specific communities over time, and to situate the role of anti-Semitism in the popular consciousness of ordinary people in past centuries.

In the social sciences, they revisited and reevaluated the theories of earlier scholars who had hypothesized about the nature of Jewish society . . .

The insistence on academic standards for research, documentation and publication was intended to clearly set the anti-Semitic scholars apart from the cruder forms of anti-Semitism that were common in Nazi Germany.

Now here is a quite revealing point that must be considered in the context of what the Nazis were writing. Steinweis noted—quite tellingly—that the Jewish scholars did not expect that their own findings and assertions as published in their own substantial body of work could ultimately be used for what were "anti-Semitic" purposes:

Jewish scholars had produced a constructive, self-critical, and empirically-based body of knowledge as part of a grand emancipatory project.

What they could not anticipate was that their work would become source material for anti-Semitic scholarship that itself aspired to scientific respectability. . . .

During the Nazi era, anti-Semitic scholars poured over the works of their Jewish counterparts, acknowledged the factual veracity of the data contained in the Jewish works, selected what they needed, and cited them extensively in support of their own racist ideology.

In a certain sense, then, the Jews had been "found out." They had unwittingly exposed themselves.

And while Steinweis writes of the Nazis and refers to "the common human tendency to reduce intellectual and moral dissonance by adjusting one's ideological beliefs to one's social and professional circumstances" this, of course, is a two-way street.

In the end, the self-aggrandizing, self-promoting, self-worshipping, self-congratulatory writings by Jewish scholars about Jewish history, achievements, culture, ideology and all manner of things became the very tools of those who sought to dislodge inordinate Jewish financial, political, and media power in Germany and throughout Europe.

To put it bluntly (and correctly), the Jews' own words were used against them. And one is tempted to say that "Turnabout is fair play."

In that regard, it is worth perusing what Steinweis found about the work of Johann von Leers—a trained jurist and a member of the faculty of law at the University of Berlin—who became known as one of the premier authors of anti-Semitic writings in the Nazi era.

According to Steinweis, von Leers published a paper entitled "The Criminality of the Jews" and even Steinweis noted that—although there were those who took offense at von Leers' assertion that Jews had a tendency toward crime—von Leers "did mobilize data from rank surveys of criminal statistics taken between 1892 and 1917." According to Steinweis:

The statistics documented proportionally high Jewish participation in several categories of non-violent crime. According to the figures, in the last decade of the 19th Century, Jews were 12 times more likely than non-Jews to be involved in usury; 11 times more likely to engage in theft of intellectual property; and 8.9 times as likely to declare fraudulent bankruptcy. Between 1903 and 1936, Leers pointed out, the frequency of Jewish participation was 29 times that of non-Jews.

Reflecting on the work of von Leers (who in 1944 published an extended version of his work under the title *The Criminal Nature of the Jews*), Steinweis was forced to acknowledge:

Notwithstanding the mendacity of Leers, it was indeed a fact that Jews were heavily involved in the management of prostitution in several countries in Europe in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries. Jewish commentators and reformers had bemoaned this problem and urged that it be combatted. . . . Leers and other anti-Semites were not the slightest bit reluctant to cite such internal Jewish critiques when it was convenient.

In a similar realm, in 2007 the University of California Press, under the patronage of the distinguished Jewish Studies Endowment Fund, published Michael Berkowitz's book, *The Crime of My Very Existence: Nazism and the Myth of Jewish Criminality* which a reviewer said made an important contribution to the understanding of how the Third Reich "appropriated and deployed long-standing stereotypes of Jewish criminality." The fact that the alleged "stereotypes" were acknowledged to be "long-standing"—that is, even in the period B.H.—Before Hitler, that is!—is telling in and of itself.

What is interesting is that the author noted that "indeed the identification of Jews with crime has a long and complex history that is not often recalled, in large part because many scholars would not think to ask. This blind spot is also a result of reticence or censorship on the part of historians who believe it impertinent to even deal with the subject, especially in the wake of the Holocaust." The author admits that "one of the initial campaigns against Jews as criminals—which did, unlike the vast majority of anti-Semitic allegations, have some basis in reality—was the reaction to the involvement of Jews in prostitution."

Likewise, in 2005, ABC-CLIO Inc. issued the previously-mentioned authoritative two-volume *Anti-Semitism: An Historical Encyclopedia of Prejudice and Persecution*, edited by Dr. Richard S. Levy, a prolific scholar of anti-Semitism. Regarding white slavery the encyclopedia said:

Beginning about 1870 Jews played a conspicuous, if not a majority, role in white slavery, the dramatic contemporary term for prostitution that was the most extensive manifestation of organized crime in the pre-World War I era.

Jewish procurers and brothel keepers were prominent in the cities of Poland, the Russian Pale, Hungary, Galicia, Bukovina, and Romania. Jews also trafficked Gentile and Jewish women along every migratory route to Western Europe, the Americas, Africa, and Asia.

There were substantial colonies of "unclean ones" as they were called by their hostile co-religionists in such places as New York, Buenos Aires, Johannesburg, and Constantinople, and there were smaller settlements in dozens of cities from Chicago to Rio De Janeiro to Harbin, Manchuria.

And for those who might be interested in reviewing the little-known (at least to the non-Jewish public) role of Jewry in global prostitution, we refer them to the 1983 volume by Edward J. Bristow, *The Jewish Fight Against White Slavery: 1870-1939*.

Published by the Jewish-oriented Schocken Books, the volume is a forthright overview of the Jewish role in the scourge of white slavery, very much akin to the devastating work, *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*, published by the Black nationalist Nation of Islam of Minister Louis Farrakhan whose researchers demonstrated, beyond any question, that Jews predominated as both slave traders and slave holders during the period of Black slavery in America—a point that hysterical Jewish critics insist is a lie but which is thoroughly documented (from Jewish sources) by the Nation of Islam.

Later, in the pages of this present volume, we will pursue the role of the Jews in the African slave trade a bit further.

Suffice it to say, then, that essentially what we have seen thus far is that much anti-Semitism has come as a response to Jewish activities and those activities were being documented by quite responsible researchers, not by gutter-level hate-mongers. And naturally, this type of documentation rang true with all people, particularly the more educated who would be inclined to read the scholarly works that were emerging in the realm of “anti-Semitic” literature.

Now, as we mentioned earlier, the popular legend is that the Jews, as a people, have suffered immensely, that they have continually been “used and abused” by all manner of people.

While, of course, it is true that the Jews (as we’ve seen) have been responsible, in a variety of ways, for instigating anti-Semitism, several responsible modern-day scholars have, for all intents and purposes, acknowledged that the popular perception of Jewish historical suffering is not quite what we have been told in the vast majority of the endless literature on the topic.

In 2010, Verso Books published *Suffering as Identity: The Jewish Paradigm*, by Esther Benbassa, a Jewish professor of Modern Jewish History at the Ecole pratique des hautes études (Sorbonne) in Paris and the author of many respected studies of Jewish history.

First published in France, Benbassa’s book was the winner of the 2008 Guizot Prize of the Académie française. Benbassa reviewed the Jewish experience during the Middle Ages which has always been cast in official history as a virtual precursor (from a Jewish perspective) to the era known as “The Holocaust.” Of the Middle Ages she writes:

At all events, the condition of the Jews was for a long time preferable to that of the serfs if only because they enjoyed relative mobility from having the right to pass from one lord to another. They were not, it may be added, the only minority in the Middle Ages. In the Christian countries, Muslims, like Jews, had

to wear insignia distinguishing them from the dominant majority, as did Christians in Muslim countries, who were subject to similar treatment and various restrictions. The most acute form of persecution of the Jews in Christian lands never took on systematic character. It is certain that they suffered from intermittent popular rioting; however, thanks to the “royal alliance,” and despite the fragility of that alliance, they were also protected by the secular authorities.

Even the Church protected them, although it professed anti-Judaism because the Jews did not acknowledge Christ’s divine nature of the fact that he was the Messiah. It extended this protection to them even while affirming that they should remain inferior, representing both punishment for their blindness and a sign of the authenticity of Christ’s message.

By the same token, the oft-mentioned “ghettos” of the Middle Ages were initially neighborhoods in which Jews willingly lived together with small numbers of Christians. It was only much later that restrictive legislation transformed those neighborhoods into segregated areas where inhabitants were separated from the rest of the population. The autonomy Jews enjoyed in these ghettos made it possible for them to survive as a “distinct nationality.” Furthermore, it is a mistake to believe that Jews had no economic or cultural contact with Christians and lived in isolation and extreme poverty, subject to constant harassment.

In the centuries preceding emancipation, the demographic growth of Jewish communities exceeded that of the Christian population. Because they were not required to perform military service, a few exceptions aside, and thanks to their neutrality, they were not decimated the way the Christians were during the wars of religion that ravaged Europe up to the 18th Century.

Jews were not as poor as other groups, due to the structures of mutual aid that they put in place, their poverty was less severe than that of the peasants.

As for the Inquisition, it did not directly persecute the Jews, ... except in the sense it censured Hebrew books. The Inquisition targeted crypto-Jews and Christians attracted by Judaism. The exceptions to this rule were Jews accused of attacking Christianity or proselytizing among Christians. Jews as such, even if they considered heretics, were beyond the Inquisition’s purview. Moors and Protestants were among the categories in which it took an interest, but its activities were aimed primarily at apostates and renegades.

Obviously, all of this constitutes a remarkable assembly of new revelations indeed—historical facts that clash directly with the image of massive persecution of the Jews during the Middle Ages that has become part and parcel of the legend of “anti-Semitism.”

Another respected scholar, Amy Chua (a professor of law at Yale University) has written a number of ground-breaking works, among which is her 2004 Anchor Books publication, *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability*. Naturally, she examines the subject of anti-Semitism.

In her book, Chua recalls how she was speaking with a professor—whom she had served alongside as a legal advisor to the post-Soviet Russian government—and in the course of that conversation she mentioned the fact that many of the new billionaire oligarchs in Russia were Jewish. Her friend (who was Jewish) became very unnerved by the discussion—despite the fact Chua herself happens to be married to a Jew!

In fact, six out of the seven oligarchs were Jewish, but yet her friend wasn't willing to discuss the matter. It was easier to avoid the topic. And that, you see, is the classic Jewish approach to such uncomfortable topics, the facts be damned.

As far the Middle Ages, Chua noted, too, that “despite recurrent anti-Jewish restrictions and persecutions, Jews prospered disproportionately as merchants and middle-men and eventually as international traders, particularly between Christian Europe and the Muslim lands.”

Chua's findings also contradict popular images of the Jews being the “victims” in Eastern European countries during the early 20th Century. Indeed, the facts that she presents lend credence to the very type of claims that Adolf Hitler and Nazi scholars were presenting to the people of Europe prior to and during World War II. Chua notes:

Jews in inter-war Romania, although just four percent of the population, controlled most of the private capital and the export, transportation, insurance, textile, chemical, housing, and publishing industries. Although their access to universities was restricted, they were also strongly represented in law, medicine, journalism, and banking.

In Poland, as of 1921, over 60% of all commerce was conducted by Jews who comprised just eleven percent of the population. Around the same time, Lithuania's Jewish minority accounted for three quarters of the country's commercial activity. Meanwhile, in Hungary, Jews in 1910 represented nearly one quarter of the population of Budapest, earning the capital the epithet of “Judapest.” As of 1920, Jews constituted 23% of

Hungary's actors and musicians, 34% of the country's authors, 51% of the attorneys, 60% of the doctors in private practice and the overwhelming majority of those “self-employed” in business and finance.

We could probably belabor the point, but it is clear. What we have been told about “anti-Semitism” through the ages is not exactly the truth. And while one recent tome, entitled *Antisemitic Myths*, would lead the reader to believe that anything negative said about Jews throughout history was a lie, educated people do know better. It hasn't just been a continuing drama of illiterate thugs and gangsters (but rather some pretty well-bred and well-educated people) who have dared to raise questions about the role of the Jews in the public arena.

Even the great German writer, Thomas Mann, a sworn enemy of the Nazis—and who left Germany as a consequence—once muttered in his diary that “the revolt against Jewish things might have my understanding to a certain extent,” this at a time when married (as he had been for over fifteen years) to a woman who had converted from Judaism.

All of this having been said, it is appropriate to close this chapter by commemorating the words of no less a cultural icon than Jewish comedienne Joan Rivers who expressed the Jewish worldview toward non-Jews as well as anyone. Miss Rivers, who is quite articulate, told Jewish writer Abigail Pogrebin (as related in the book, *Stars of David*) that she believes Israel—the Jewish state—is truly imperiled and added:

I worry that they're going to wipe it off the Earth. I only hope that they [Israel] will take us all with them, because Jews shouldn't go quietly this time. If they're going to kill us, we're going to kill you right back.

And these words, you see, demonstrate precisely why non-Jews do have something to worry about, why they do need to investigate all of these matters further. These suicidal rantings—in the context of Jewish concerns—have been made not only by the likes of Joan Rivers, but—as we shall see later—they are also found in the writings of distinguished American Jewish and Israeli academics and geopolitical strategists.

All together it suggests that this type of thought runs rampant within the mindset of the Jewish community. An attitude of superiority, coupled with an angry outlook toward non-Jews throughout history, saddled with a certain stream of psychological instability—an explosive formula that could spark a global nuclear Holocaust. And in this regard we will now address a most controversial reality: Jewish claims that they, the Jews, constitute a superior race of people.



The rare French lithograph from the mid-1880s portrays the Jew as standing at the top of the French social, political and economic pyramid, outranking the king, the nobility, the clergy, the military, the beggars and the peasantry. The quaint cartoon below, with a double-edged meaning, appeared in the British satirical journal *Puck* (circa 1880). A Jewish peddler carrying his wares of poetry, music, statesmanship, science, literature, patriotism—and promissory notes—thumbs his nose at German chancellor Bismarck and American hotel keeper Henry Hilton who barred Jews from his hotels, telling his Gentile tormenters: “I have thriven on this sort of thing for 18 centuries—Go on, gentlemen, persecution helps de bizness [i.e. business].”



CHAPTER THREE

Are the Jews a Superior Race—As They Claim? A Leading Cause of Anti-Semitism Dissected

Let it be said—matter of factly—that one of the primary reasons for anti-Semitism throughout history has been precisely because of the fact that throughout history—up to and including today—the Jews have proclaimed themselves to each other and to others as not just “the Chosen People of God,” but also that they are, in fact, a superior race of people.

The irony is that even as Jewish philosophers, academics, and propagandists proclaim their people to be God’s Chosen and a cut above all others on an intellectual scale—why, after all, they can produce standardized tests that “prove” it—at the same time (for public consumption) they argue vociferously that they are “a religion, not a race.” And there’s nothing that the Jews love more than hearing a Christian declare: “Jews are just like everybody else. They just go to a different church.”

Let’s be honest: Jews *don’t* believe that they are “just like everybody else”—but *they want non-Jews to believe it when that belief is beneficial to Jewish interests.*

I will be candid: I’m offended by the Jewish claim of being the apple of God’s eye. I’m offended by the Jewish claim of intellectual superiority. To Hell with them.

As a child growing up, I was always taught that the idea of a “superior race” was an evil thing, something right out of Adolf Hitler’s Third Reich. So you can imagine how, as I grew older and began exploring Jewish writings, that I discovered that this is precisely what the Jews have said: that the Jews are a superior race of people. And I am far from being the only individual to have noted these claims.

Professor Albert S. Lindemann of the University of California at Santa Barbara has devoted years of research into studying the phenomenon of anti-Semitism and in his landmark work, *Esau’s Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*, published by Cambridge University Press in 2000, this forthright Jewish historian stated flatly:

The argument that anti-Semitism is an entirely baseless hatred, having nothing to do with Jewish reality or Jewish action in the real world, is contradicted not only by elements of Jewish tradition and by Zionist perspectives but also by many other sources.

There is, for example, the assertion of the extremely influential 17th Century philosopher Baruch Spinoza, recognized as one of the most profound thinkers of early modern Europe, that

Jewish separatism and sense of superiority linked to Jewish religious rituals that insult, denigrate, and threaten other religions, have been fundamental factors in evoking hatred for Jews throughout the ages.

In the 20th Century the noted author Arthur Koestler has stated the matter with characteristic bluntness: "The Jewish religion, unlike any other, is racially discriminatory and nationally segregative, and socially tension-creating."

No less a substantial figure in the modern Jewish world as Avi Beker, the former secretary general of the World Jewish Congress (and now a professor at Georgetown University) has also recognized the problem.

Writing in his 2008 book, *The Chosen: The History of an Idea and the Anatomy of an Obsession* (published by Palgrave MacMillan), Beker explored the theme of the "chosenness" of the Jewish people and—as Beker's publisher described it—"why it remains the central unspoken and explosive psychological, historical and theological problem at the heart of Jewish-Gentile relations."

In his book, Beker noted that in recent years respected figures such as the renowned Greek composer Mikos Theodorakis and the Portuguese Nobel Laureate Jose Saramago had risen up in criticism of Israel and the Jewish people and, in so doing, were directly confronting the Jewish theme of "chosenness."

In 2004, Theodorakis spoke about Israel being the root of the world's evil and of Jewish control of finance and the media. Theodorakis attributed this to Jewish "arrogance" and the "fanaticism of their Biblical forefathers" and "the thought that they are the Chosen People. . . ." Saramago accused the Jews of appropriating the status of being a "Chosen People" for themselves.

That the beloved Greek composer Theodorakis—also a former government minister and a long a fierce advocate for human rights—openly slammed the practices of Israel and its supporters around the globe was a major scandal, due—of course—to the fact that the Jewish-controlled media deemed it to be so and thus made it so.

And yet, although he was roundly criticized, Theodorakis came back at his critics and said in an interview with Israel's newspaper *Ha'aretz*:

I didn't say that Jews are the root of evil. I said that they are at the root of evil. Jews want to feel that they are victims. They want to console themselves by saying: We are in the right, we are victims again, let's build another ghetto. This is a masochistic reaction. There is a masochistic mentality in Jewish tradition.

I am sure that when Jews of the diaspora speak amongst themselves, they feel satisfaction. They think—now, when we are so close to the world's biggest nation, no one can harm us. We can do whatever we like.

This is why their claim about [a new rise in] anti-semitism is not only sick. It is devious. It allows the Jews to do whatever they will. It serves as an excuse politically as well as psychologically.

The aforementioned Portuguese writer Jose Saramago—winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in the field of literature—took on global Zionism in the Spanish newspaper *El Pais*. He said:

Intoxicated mentally by the messianic dream of a Greater Israel which will finally achieve the expansionist dreams of the most radical Zionism; contaminated by the monstrous and rooted "certitude" that in this catastrophic and absurd world there exists a people chosen by God and that, consequently, all the actions of an obsessive, psychological and pathologically exclusivist racism are justified; educated and trained in the idea that any suffering that has been inflicted, or is being inflicted, or will be inflicted on everyone else, especially the Palestinians, will always be inferior to that which they themselves suffered in the Holocaust, the Jews endlessly scratch their own wound to keep it bleeding, to make it incurable, and they show it to the world as if it were a banner.

What is disturbing to those who hold Israel and its supporters in high esteem is that they cannot so easily dismiss the likes of Theodorakis and Saramago as "Nazi apologists" or "right-wing extremists."

What's more, the fact is that increasing numbers of intellectuals across the globe share the concerns expressed by Theodorakis and Saramago and they, too, are daring to speak out.

Now these, of course, are the remarks of two individuals—otherwise esteemed—who have been accused of anti-Semitism. But their remarks are founded on their concern—which is mine—that the Jews have declared themselves to be above all others.

And the truth is that a review of Jewish writings—even in the modern day—as well as of writings by those who share the Jewish viewpoint demonstrates that this is precisely what the Jews believe.

First a brief look at some of the almost hysterically sycophantic preachings of an American writer of Irish descent, Thomas Cahill, whose 1999 work, *The Gifts of the Jews: How a Tribe of Desert Nomads Changed the Way Everyone Thinks and Feels*, put forth one of the most

outrageously outlandish propositions about the Jews ever committed to print. He actually wrote this:

The Jews gave us a whole new vocabulary, a whole new Temple of the Spirit, an inner landscape of ideas and feelings that had never been known before. . . .

Because of their unique belief—monotheism—the Jews were able to give us the Great Whole, a unified universe that makes sense and that, because of its evident superiority as a world view, completely overwhelms the warring and contradictory phenomena of polytheism. . . .

The Jews gave us the Outside and the Inside—our outlook and our inner life. We can hardly get up in the morning or cross the street without being Jewish. We dream Jewish dreams and hope Jewish hopes.

Most of our best words, in fact—*new, adventure, surprise, unique, individual, person, vocation, time, history, future, freedom, progress, faith, hope, justice*—are the gifts of the Jews. [Cahill's emphasis]

Now—as a brief digression—just imagine the preceding paragraphs from Cahill's work with the word "Aryans" substituted for the word "Jews." Imagine taking those writings (with the substitution of the word "Aryans" for "Jews") to a public high school teacher and saying, "Here's a very prime example of Nazi thought about the superiority of the Aryans. You can use this in your class to demonstrate to your students the kind of horrific preachings of racial superiority that the Nazis engaged in."

One can just imagine the enthusiasm with which that "teacher" would jump on the opportunity to trash and condemn the kind of sentiments expressed in Cahill's writings, if—that is—the teacher actually believed those to be "Nazi" writings.

And one can also imagine the outright embarrassment that so-called educator might find himself suffering when learning that instead of such pandering rhetoric being the work of the dreaded Nazis, it was, rather, the work of a writer praising the Jews to high Heaven.

Now Thomas Cahill is hardly the only "Goy" to write such nonsense about Jewish superiority and get much favorable publicity and publishing deals in return for it. Not in the least!

As the aforementioned Avi Beker noted in his book, *The Chosen*, Charles Murray—described by Beker as "an American Gentile and a scholar"—wrote an article entitled "Jewish Genius" for the April 2007 issue of *Commentary* magazine, the voice of the American Jewish Committee, in

which Murray "tried to develop a theory on the Jews' extraordinary intellectual skills to explain their outstanding and disproportional contribution to science and the advancement of mankind." According to Beker:

[Murray] focuses his argument on the "Jewish genius" . . . on their system of education and religious studies as an evolutionary process that he traces back to the period before the first century BCE, before the destruction of the Second Temple. . . .

Murray goes back to Moses, who propagated God's commandments, which were intertwined with intellectual complexity and required intense learning and deep insight.

But despite his "evolutionary" theory, Murray admits at the end: "I take sanctuary in my remaining hypothesis, uniquely parsimonious and happily irrefutable. The Jews are God's [C]hosen [P]eople."

What is interesting is that the aforementioned Murray was co-author with the late Richard Herrnstein—a Harvard-based Jewish psychologist—of the 1994 work, *The Bell Curve*, which asserted that Blacks were intellectually inferior to Whites and that—although few people noted this point—Whites were intellectually inferior to Jews.

The tip-off should have been obvious when one considered the source of this volume—the Free Press, founded by two Jewish editors, Jeremiah Kaplan and Charles Liebman—was an imprint of the venerable Jewish publishing house, Simon & Schuster.

And it is probably worth noting that Simon & Schuster—like many publishing concerns—has been owned, through the course of a variety of complex corporate deals, by such major international Jewish-controlled media concerns as Gulf + Western and Viacom. And now, today, Simon & Schuster is a subsidiary of CBS, the broadcasting and publishing conglomerate controlled by the billionaire Jewish Tisch family.

So it was a Jewish writer (Herrnstein), in conjunction with his Gentile colleague (Murray)—sponsored by a major Jewish publishing house—putting forth the proposition of Jewish intellectual superiority.

This is a factor that was never addressed anywhere by anybody at the time, although I should note that when I mentioned it—more often than once—to many of my associates, they somehow failed to understand the point at all, missing the fact that the book was essentially—to put it bluntly—Jewish supremacist propaganda.

And considering the grand publicity accompanying the release of the book, this alone should have demonstrated to some of the more discerning among them that there was much more to the story.

The Internet source, Wikipedia, provides us an interesting outline of the treatment that the release of the book received in the American (Jewish-controlled) media:

Initially, *The Bell Curve* received a great deal of positive publicity, including cover stories in *Newsweek* ("the science behind [it] is overwhelmingly mainstream"), early publication (under protest by other writers and editors) in *The New Republic* by its editor-in-chief at the time Andrew Sullivan, and *The New York Times Book Review* (which suggested critics disliked its "appeal to sweet reason" and are "inclined to hang the defendants without a trial"). Early articles and editorials appeared in *Time*, *The New York Times* ("makes a strong case"), *The New York Times Magazine*, *Forbes*, *the Wall Street Journal*, and *National Review*. It received a respectful airing on such shows as *Nightline*, *MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour*, *The McLaughlin Group*, *Think Tank*, *PrimeTime Live*, and *All Things Considered*. The book sold over 500,000 copies in hardcover.

What is ironic is that when this book was published to such great acclaim, self-styled "White Separatists" rushed to hail the book, despite the fact that they—as Whites—were being declared inferior to the Jews. In fact, most of those Whites probably never read the book but relied upon self-appointed "intellectual leaders" such as one Jared Taylor to tell them why the book was such a milestone. Taylor endorsed *The Bell Curve* and thus endorsed Jewish intellectual superiority.

This perhaps explains why the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) has pointed out that Taylor "eschews anti-Semitism" and that he has referred to Jews as the "conscience of society." In addition, as I revealed (to the shock of many) in my book, *The Judas Goats*, Taylor's wife—an academic "studying" White Separatists—maintained a cordial working relationship with the ADL's longtime chief "fact finder" Irwin Suall, a fact first revealed to me by respected Revisionist scholar Theodore J. O'Keefe.

All things considered, it is no surprise that Taylor's own book, *Paved With Good Intentions*, was favorably mentioned in the February 1993 issue of the American Jewish Committee's *Commentary*, which later published Charles Murray's paean to "Jewish Genius." And—not coincidentally—Taylor's book was endorsed by Murray's *Bell Curve* co-author, Richard Herrnstein. In that regard, we can understand why some wags refer to Jared Taylor as "The Jews' Favorite White Separatist."

Now let it be said that Herrnstein, Murray and Taylor were not saying anything new. In fact, historically, Jews have—as a group—always followed the theme of Jewish "chosenness" and superiority.

The very fact Jews routinely and casually refer to non-Jews as "Goyim" tells us everything we need to know about their attitude toward non-Jews: the term "Goyim" as we have noted, is the equivalent of "beast" (or more specifically, "cattle").

Indeed, the most dedicated and orthodox of the Jews have always felt that non-Jews represented something repugnant (and this view is not just limited to the Orthodox among the Jews, it is sad to say, however much some may wish to dispute the fact).

Raphael Patai, an eminent Jewish writer—in his book, *The Jewish Mind* (republished in 1996 by Hatherleigh Press)—asserts that the Hasidic [i.e. deeply Orthodox] Jews considered the following such traits as unpleasanties that were features of the Gentile environment:

A fondness for horses, wine, strong drink, beautiful women, and powerful smoke, an un-controlled temper, sexual immodesty, the use of profane language, love of singing and dancing, a preoccupation with nocturnal demonic dangers, proneness to epileptic fits, and a characteristic presence strong enough to fell groups of trembling peasants.

Addressing the question: "Is there such a thing as global Jewish influence?" Patai also noted even though—he contended—anti-Semites overestimate the power of the Jews, there is—he said—"also a Jewish over-estimation of the global significance of the Jews."

And what is notable, as even Patai admits, is that this Jewish mind-set reflects what can only be described as the Jewish view of Jewish superiority. This view, according to Patai:

[Goes] back to Talmudic times, when some sages were convinced that the whole world existed only for the sake of Israel and that, conversely, the existence of the whole world depended upon Israel's fulfilling the role, the religious function, allotted to it by God.

A late, faint echo of this view could be found in the teachings of Reform Judaism in their "classical form" which dates from the 19th Century, and which maintained that while Judaism was nothing but a religion, it had a global mission: to spread the faith of pure ethical monotheism all over the world.

A more restrained but no less strongly pro-Jewish view is the one embraced by a number of modern historians who have presented, eloquently and in considerable detail, the Jewish contribution to civilization.

And certainly no shrinking violent when endorsing Jewish superiority, Patai claimed this:

One can generalize and assert that, apart from some isolated areas of the globe which are shrinking daily, all mankind is affected in one way or another by the products of the Jewish mind, and, one may add, no other human group can boast of an even remotely comparable record.

Note, too, the words of Rabbi Solomon Schindler of Boston's Temple Israel, speaking in 1887 (cited in Jewish writer Eric L. Goldstein's 2006 work, *The Price of Whiteness: Jews, Race, and American Identity*, published by Princeton University Press). The rabbi pulled no punches, asserting that Jews were, in fact, different:

It remains a fact that we spring from a different branch of humanity, that different blood flows in our veins, that our temperament, our tastes, our humor is different. . . . In a word, we differ [from non-Jews] in our views and in our mode of thinking, in many cases as much as we differ in our features.

This rabbi was no extremist. He was a mainstream and respected spiritual icon of a leading urban American Jewish community. And his words reflected traditional Jewish religious and social—and really, political—thinking. And even today there are eminent Jews who mirror the rabbi's mindset. In his work, *The Chosen*, Avi Beker cited the words of famed "liberal" actor Richard Dreyfuss:

I am a passionately secular Jewish agnostic who sincerely believes that Jews are the Chosen People, so go figure! . . . I believe we are chosen to illuminate the Jewish condition. Our ethics are mankind's greatest victories."

So although Dreyfuss calls himself a "secular Jewish agnostic"—that is, someone who ostensibly doesn't follow the Jewish religion—he still abides by the Jewish teaching that the Jews are—as he said—"the Chosen People." Dreyfuss also made this amazing confession:

I was one of those secret progressive Jews who believes that we are the Chosen People, we are, and even when that became not politically correct to say, I still do believe that.

The fact that Dreyfuss would even use the term "secret" in regard to his feelings and those of other self-styled "progressive" Jews might be fuel for the minds of conspiracy theorists and those who believe things about Jews that they are not supposed to believe. But those were his words. And those words say a lot about attitudes on the part of Jews toward non-Jews that non-Jews are not supposed to know about.

Now before the reader is tempted to dismiss Dreyfuss as "only an actor"—and bear in mind that Dreyfuss is often described by the media as an "intellectual" and as a bit of a philosopher—it is important to note that even so towering a figure as Britain's first Jewish-born Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli (baptized as a Christian) went so far as to express the theme of Jewish superiority. In his book, *The Biography of Lord George Bentinck*, Disraeli wrote boldly and in no uncertain terms:

The world . . . discovered that it is impossible to destroy the Jews. The attempt to extirpate them has been made under the most favourable auspices and on the largest scale; the most considerable means that man could command have been pertinaciously applied to this object for the longest period of recorded time.

Egyptian pharaohs, Assyrian kings, Roman emperors, Scandinavian crusaders, Gothic princes and holy inquisitors, have alike devoted their energies to the fulfillment of this common purpose.

Expatriation, exile, captivity, confiscation, torture on the most ingenious and massacre on the most extensive scale, a curious system of degrading customs and debasing laws which would have broken the heart of any other people, have been tried, and in vain.

The Jews, after all this havoc, are probably more numerous at this date than they were during the reign of Solomon the Wise, are found in all lands, and . . . prospering in most.

All which proves, that it is in vain for man to attempt to baffle the inexorable law of nature which has decreed that *a superior race shall never be destroyed or absorbed by an inferior*. [Emphasis added.]

Disraeli was no Orthodox mystic huddling in a Polish shtetl divorced from the world of the Gentiles. Instead, he was very much a modern Renaissance man, a dandy beloved by the ladies and an undoubted intellectual who rode to the heights of power as the political leader of the British Empire in the heady days of the Victorian Era.

And it was this Disraeli who asserted that, truly, the Jews were superior to all others. Here, further, is what Disraeli wrote:

They [the Jews] are a living and most striking evidence of the falsity of that pernicious doctrine of modern times, the equality of man . . . the natural equality of man now in vogue, and taking the form of cosmopolitan fraternity, is a principle which, were it possible to act on it, would deteriorate the great races and destroy all the genius of the world.

What would be the consequence on the great Anglo-Saxon republic, for example, were its citizens to secede from their sound principle of reserve, and mingle with their negro and coloured populations?

In the course of time they would become so deteriorated that their States would probably be re-conquered and regained by the aborigines whom they expelled and who would then be their superiors.

But though nature will never ultimately permit this theory of natural equality to be practised, the preaching of this dogma has already caused much mischief, and may occasion more.

The native tendency of the Jewish race, who are justly proud of their blood, is against the doctrine of the equality of man. [Emphasis added.]

Benjamin Ginsburg, a Jewish academic, writing in *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State* (published in 1993 by the University of Chicago Press) effectively suggests that modern-day Jews (in America, at least) actually share the 19th Century attitude put forth by Disraeli:

Though Jews have learned to look, talk and dress like other Americans, they are not fully assimilated either in their own minds or in the eyes of their neighbors. . . .

To make matters worse, Jews often, secretly or not so secretly, conceive themselves to be morally and intellectually superior to their neighbors. . . . Indeed, Jews are extremely successful outsiders who sometimes have the temerity to rub it in.

No less than Elmer Davis, an eminent award-winning journalist who was director of the U.S. Office of War Information during World War II, writing as part of a "symposium for better understanding," criticized Americanized Jews who "seem to feel that they are at once Americans exactly like the rest of us, and Jews wholly different from the rest of us."

This attitude, according to Davis, helped fuel anti-Semitism, a force, he said, that would not die out "until the Jewishness of the average Jew means no more to him than [the fact that] I am of Baptist training and British-German ancestry means to me."

And to their credit, there have been Jewish voices, likewise, that have raised concerns about the Jewish attitude of supremacy and superiority. Dr. Walter Beran Wolfe, a Vienna-born Jewish psychologist, reflected on these matters, writing that "the sooner the Jew realizes that being a Jew is neither a special privilege nor a special disgrace, the sooner will he prepare his rightful place in the fellowship of mankind."

In the same progressive vein, Isaac Landman, a Reform rabbi who served as editor of *The American Hebrew* and who was a moving spirit behind the founding of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, was very critical of "political and racial propaganda" put out by Zionist elements and he even criticized what he called the social habits of Jews:

When we make public exhibitions of ourselves, load ourselves down with diamonds and furs . . . and persist in telling the world at the tops of our voices that we are Jews, we are . . . guilty of creating race feeling."

In more recent times, an American Jewish writer, Roberta Strauss Feuerlicht, came forth in 1983 with a remarkable book that addressed such attitudes in the Jewish community. Published by Times Books, *The Fate of the Jews: A People Torn Between Israeli Power and Jewish Ethics*, should have been a wake-up call for Jews in not just Israel but in the United States and around the world.

Brutally honest, the author asserted with all candor that "Jewish separateness was not exclusively forced upon them by anti-Semitic Gentiles; it was often the chosen position of the Chosen People." She cited famed Jewish philosopher Hannah Arendt who wrote:

The belief that the Jewish people had always been the passive, suffering object of Christian persecutions actually amounted to a prolongation and modernization of the old myth of chosenness.

Strauss-Feuerlicht described this historical phenomenon and its origins within the religious teachings of the Jewish people:

Belief in their chosen-ness, and their stringent dietary laws, separated Jews from their environment. No matter where they

lived, they felt religiously superior to the host nation. The poorest Jew in an Eastern European shtetl felt superior not only to the [Gentile]peasants but to the nobility because he had the Torah and they did not.

This feeling of separateness was so pervasive that it was held by secular Jews . . . Jews were prohibited from fraternizing with Gentiles in any but the briefest transactions. . . The most common social act—two men having a drink together—was forbidden between Jew and non-Jew.

Even in Russia, the author noted, not all of the oppression of Jews could be blamed on the czar:

The small town—or shtetl—of the Pale [of Settlement] was basically a theocracy governed by the Orthodox. Life revolved about study and worship; secular books or joys or thoughts were not permitted. Nor were there any fresh Jewish thoughts; for lack of contact with the outside world, religion was ossified in ritual and superstition.

Although the shtetl life is glorified today and commemorated lovingly in Broadway's *Fiddler on the Roof* and in all other manner of media, Jewish historian Simon Dubnow wrote what Strauss-Feurlicht described as an eloquent denunciation of the educational system of the shtetl when he described its nature:

The entire Pale is filled with thousands of children's prisons. These children are criminally tortured both in spirit and in body. Emaciated youngsters leave these institutions.

They know nothing of childhood, fields, meadows, or blue skies. They pass away their finest years of childhood within four walls, in sticky air, in spiritual tension that is far too much for their meager energies, under the rod of ignoramuses.

An enormous storehouse of Babylonian wisdom is forcibly injected into the brains of these youngsters. They are told nothing about the real world, about nature and life, but only about the next world and about death.

So the fact is that the vaunted shtetls of the Eastern European Jewish world—from whence came so many eminent American Jews, ranging from gangland kingpin Meyer Lansky to grand Hollywood moguls such as Louis B. Mayer to media titan David Sarnoff—the list goes on and on—was a laboratory for the idea of chosen-ness, one based on insularity, prej-

udice (toward non-Jews) and an attitude of supremacy, the very type of mindset that we have been told time and again was the nature of the anti-Jewish thinking that led to the rise of Adolf Hitler and the advent of that period known as "The Holocaust."

This Jewish mindset, one that has an element of underlying violence (and downright hatred) is probably best reflected in the words of Ben Hecht, an outspoken hard-line Zionist who was one of America's best known figures on Broadway and in Hollywood—a multi-talented screenwriter, director, producer and playwright.

In May of 1947, Hecht wrote an admiring letter addressed "To The Terrorists of Palestine"—the members of the Jewish terror bund known as the Irgun (then led by future Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin)—and Hecht's letter was published as a full-page advertisement in New York newspapers. It read in part:

My dear friends, on my word as an old reporter, what I write is true. The Jews in America are for you. You are their champions. You are the grin they wear. You are the feather in their hats. . . . Every time you blow up a British arsenal, or wreck a British jail, or send a British railroad train sky-high, or rob a British bank, or let go with your guns and bombs at British betrayers and invaders of your homeland, the Jews of America make a little holiday in their hearts.

In fact, eleven weeks later two British sergeants were hanged by the Irgun in reprisal for the British execution of two Irgun terrorists. And not surprisingly, reporters phoned Hecht to ask him if he had a "little holiday" in his heart.

Imagine the response today if an American Muslim wrote a letter to alleged *Muslim* terrorists in Palestine (which is now under the heel of Jewry) and declared a "little holiday" in his heart every time a Muslim committed a crime against the Jewish occupiers. Would his letter be published as a full-page advertisement in any of the New York newspapers? Would he—if he were a playwright or screenwriter, for example—still be hailed on Broadway and in Hollywood? Think about it.

Did I not tell you at the beginning that "lies, bullying and double-standards" are always in play when it comes to matters relating to the interests of the Jewish community and the state of Israel?

Here was Ben Hecht—one of the truly "great" Jews of America, an icon of the entertainment industry whose words captivated millions on stage and screen—celebrating murder and terrorism by Jews against no less than British soldiers, the military forces of America's beloved "Mother Country."

Can there be any wonder why most human beings might find the words of this great icon of the Jewish people offensive?

Can there be any wonder that so many human beings find in Zionism and the Jewish Agenda a certain venality and inhumanity?

Can there be any wonder why when such rhetoric is celebrated by Jews that there is such a thing called "anti-Semitism"?

Needless to say, thank God, there are some Jews who have overcome this mindset that seems to be so central to Jewish thinking. One of them is Joel Kovel whose book, *Overcoming Zionism* (published in 2007 by Pluto Press in London), advocates the creation of a single democratic state in Israel/Palestine.

In his book, Kovel cites another independent-minded American Jewish writer, Seymour Hersh, quoting an Israeli official upset over President Dwight Eisenhower's reaction to the invasion of Sinai:

We got the message. We can still remember the smell of Auschwitz and Treblinka.

Next time we'll take all of you with us.

Again, another of the monstrous, threatening, hate-filled remarks of which we have reflected upon in these pages. And Kovel notes that this was the "climate" in which he (Kovel) was raised in a Jewish home in the United States. Kovel recalled one of his tutors for his lessons in Hebrew school and said of that tutor that

It seemed as though he barely ever got out of his chair, much less saw the sun, but what really impressed was the violence of his views.

The words were positively spat out, bearing hatred for the Goyim who had persecuted our superior people, the chosen ones of God.

And for what? "I'll tell you what," said the tutor, with blazing eyes and Old Testament wrath, "for a 'savior' who wasn't even born legitimate. That's right, his parents weren't married. The so-called god of the Christians was a bastard."

Kovel commented: "Who could have guessed that many such as him would immigrate to Israel from our neighborhood and come to play an important role in the future Jewish state?" Kovel concludes:

Tribalism is the curse of Judaism, whether as practiced by my Orthodox tutor in Brooklyn . . . or, in imperial form, by the

state of Israel and the Zionist movement that nourishes it. It is an endless return, bound to the wheel of revenge.

Mark Ellis—a university professor of Jewish studies and the founding director of the Center for Jewish Studies at Baylor University—is a leading authority on contemporary Judaism and has been described as one of the most influential Jewish thinkers of his generation.

But in his book *Judaism Does Not Equal Israel* (published in 2009 by the New Press in New York) he has staked out a position—most humane and forward-looking—that rejects the Jewish mindset that has stoked up so much anti-Semitism through the ages. Ellis asserts in no uncertain terms that it is time for Jews to redirect their thinking:

It is crystal clear that we as Jews have come to the end of the Jewish history we have known and inherited. Making ethical claims about the Jewish tradition in relation to other communities is no longer possible.

Whether, in fact, Jews historically ever had an ethical edge is open to dispute. What Jews did have was the claim they made. This claim helped us through difficult and dark periods.

With this ethical claim our history could be seen through the lenses of innocents suffering and divinely mandated, innocent empowerment. That claim is now unavailable—even as we need it more than ever.

Those of us among the "Goyim" who share the concerns of those Jews such as Joel Kovel and Mark Ellis must use whatever influence we have to encourage the Jewish community to "come down to earth" and reject its historic and traditional attitude of enmity and distrust and feeling of superiority and chosen-ness.

It is no coincidence, you see, that when Jews emigrate to Israel that they call this "aliyah"—which means "to step up." Instead, Jews must step down. The Jews *must* join the community of mankind.

Otherwise, there is no way the rest of the world can continue to tolerate the attitudes—and the resulting policies (most especially the continuing wars of imperial aggression designed to advance the New World Order)—that have come to be associated with the Jewish Agenda.

Ultimately, if the Jewish people refuse to consign to the trash heap of history their out-moded, archaic, racist and supremacist point of view, the rest of the peoples on our planet will be forced to demand an accounting. And that could result in very real anti-Semitism, the likes of which we have never seen before.



On two occasions, Michael Collins Piper has had the honor of meeting Minister Louis Farrakhan, leader of the Nation of Islam. By any estimation, Farrakhan is the most honest and outspoken Black leader in America today, one who speaks truths that few others of any race dare.

Minister Louis Farrakhan Speaks Out . . .

For the small numbers of Jewish people in the United States, they exercise extraordinary control, and Black people will never be free in this country until they are free of that kind of control. . . . [The Jews] are the greatest controllers of Black minds, Black intelligence. They write the foolish scripts on television that our people portray. They are the movie moguls that feature us in these silly, degrading, degenerate roles. The great recording companies that portray our people in such a filthy and low-rating way

. . . You have lost your democracy to special interest groups All of you know what I'm talking about: Zionist control of the government of the United States. Republicans can't get together with Democrats. Only when something is affecting Israel, then both sides come together. Something is wrong with that picture.

. . . I can't tell Black people to fight a war that is Israel's war. What kind of leader will you be, or should I be, to allow these babies—Black, White and Brown—to fight Israel's war, because Zionists dominate the government of the United States of America and her banking system?

. . . The Federal Reserve is a group of Jewish and Gentile bankers that took over the printing of your money. It's not U.S.-government owned, it's a family of Jewish and Gentile international bankers, the head of whom is the Rothschild family.

. . . Ever since 1913 there has been an effort by certain groups—the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderberg, the Council on Foreign Relations—and these are forces (along with the Freemasons) that are secret societies desirous of a world government run by an elite that controls the resources of every nation on the Earth

—Excerpts from Minister Farrakhan's public commentary.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Jews and the Blacks and Martin Luther King: The Myth of Jewish Liberalism

In our previous chapter we explored—in some detail—the quite chilling racist attitudes by the Jews toward non-Jews, views expressed in the most direct terms possible, asserting Jewish racial supremacy and superiority: intellectually, morally, spiritually.

However, despite the ever-heard Jewish claim that the Jewish people were always in the forefront of advancing “equality” and bringing equal rights for African-Americans, a historical review of this issue demonstrates that the image (coming from Jewish propaganda sources) is hardly akin to reality. And in the pages that follow we will take a particularly close look at the little-known facts about the relationship between the American Jewish community and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the iconic figure who has come to represent the civil rights movement itself.

While we have often heard of the “racist” writings of American southern novelist Thomas W. Dixon, whose book *The Clansman* inspired the famous film, *The Birth of a Nation*, which—by the way—was largely brought to American audiences by Jewish-owned film distribution companies—Dixon himself once wrote that Jews “belong to our race” and that “The Jews have achieved a noble civilization.”

And although modern-day Jewish organizations often pander to African-American groups, citing Dixon's work as being akin to the writings of “the Nazis,” it turns out that Dixon also asserted at one point that the Jew “had his poets, prophets and kings when our Germanic ancestors were still in the woods cracking coconuts and hickory nuts with monkeys”—hardly the writing of an “Aryan” supremacist!

These amazing little-known assertions by Dixon were cited by Jewish writer Eric L. Goldstein in *The Price of Whiteness: Jews, Race, and American Identity* (published by Princeton University Press in 2006).

Goldstein noted, in fact, that—in 1907—Dixon featured a heroic Jewish character in his book, *The Traitor*, his third novel in his Clansman trilogy, and described how the “true” members of the Ku Klux Klan came to the defense of an old Jewish storekeeper in the face of attacks from a group of renegade Klansmen. Goldstein noted another point that modern-day Jewish “civil rights” organizations would rather that African-Americans not know about:

Despite the anti-Semitic rhetoric of the Ku Klux Klan, tales abound of the organizations “frequent cordiality” toward Jews in both the north and the south. In certain cities the Klan threw its

support behind Jewish political candidates and sometimes extended offers of membership to Jews.

And when famed Black educator, Booker T. Washington, wrote in his book, *The Future of the American Negro*, that a rightful comparison could be made of prejudice toward both Blacks and Jews, *The New Orleans Jewish Ledger* referred to Washington as an "impudent nigger" for doing so. And as Goldstein pointed out, when Thomas W. Dixon attacked Washington for making this comparison, the *Ledger* even reprinted Dixon's comments and then said:

To compare the Jew, who occupies the highest pinnacle of human superiority and intellectual attainment, with the Negro, who forms the mud at its base, is something that only a Negro with more than the usual vanity and impudence of his race could attempt.

So, even in the midst of attacking "the Negro," the Jewish newspaper could not restrain itself from asserting that Jews occupied—in that newspaper's words—"the highest pinnacle of human superiority and intellectual attainment."

Now although many modern-day Jewish sources might rush to suggest that this New Orleans Jewish newspaper was simply reflecting "the Southern mindset of the time," a New York newspaper, *The Jewish Record*, also expressed similar thoughts when it editorialized:

We know not how to speak in the same breath of the Negro and the Israelite . . . One representing all that is debased and inferior in the hopeless barbarity and heathenism of 6,000 years; the other, the days when Jehovah conferred on our fathers a glorious equality which led the Eternal to converse with them.

And as we noted earlier in these pages, the Jewish record as far as the African-American slave trade is not so spotless as the Jews would have African-Americans (and all others) believe. It is not just "Black extremists" such as Louis Farrakhan and the Nation of Islam or outspoken Wellesley College Professor Tony Martin who have pointed this out.

For example, Jewish writer Murray Friedman's 2005 book, *The Neo-Conservative Revolution: Jewish Intellectuals and the Shaping of Public Policy* (Cambridge University Press, New York) pointed out:

In the 19th Century, many Jewish leaders were also conservative on the issue of slavery; relatively few joined the abolitionists. and many, in fact, opposed them.

Isaac Meyer Wise, the most prominent spokesman for Reform Judaism, the leading Jewish religious body at the time, was more critical of abolitionists, whom he termed "wicked preachers" and "fanatics," than of slaveholders. He claimed to find justification for the practice [of slavery] in Biblical texts.

Roberta Strauss-Feuerlicht has also noted the substantial Jewish role in the world of the African slave trade and has cited the work of Rabbi Bertram W. Korn, the most eminent of the scholars of 19th Century American Jewry:

According to Rabbi Korn's meticulously documented research on Jews and Southern slavery, only one Jew ever worked as an overseer, but possibly a greater proportion of Jews than Christians were slave owners . . .

Just as a disproportionately large number of Jews were slave owners, a disproportionately large number of Jewish merchants sold slaves as they would any other goods. Several of these merchants were prominent in their communities: an acting rabbi, the president of a congregation.

Strauss-Feuerlicht put it quite simply and truthfully when she pointed out that "very few Southern Jews actually opposed slavery. . . . There were also Northern Jews who supported slavery," noting that Rabbi Korn could only find two rabbis who were committed abolitionists.

Quite in contrast, Rabbi Morris J. Raphall, one of the most prominent rabbis in America, gave a fiery speech in 1861 in opposition to abolition and in favor of slavery.

According to Strauss-Feuerlicht, "the sermon made it appear that slavery was not only lawful but a religious obligation, and that abolition was blasphemy." She added:

Since Rabbi Raphall was the highest-paid clergyman in America and the first rabbi to deliver the opening prayer at a session of Congress, the religious argument seemed to have been settled in favor of the slave holders.

In more recent years, we find stark evidence—really, shocking evidence—that the American Jewish community's relationship with the civil rights movement might not have been so intimate and loving as the Jews would have us believe. While the Jews have masqueraded as the "leaders" of the civil rights movement, the record suggests otherwise.

This little-known fact has always come as a surprise to many in the "white separatist" movement that has always pointed toward the fact that Jewish money and support for "Black" organizations was pivotal before and during the civil rights struggles of the 20th Century. However, if we consider alone the nature of the Jewish attitude toward even Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.—the paramount icon of the era—we find another story altogether, one that the white separatists find hard to digest. But the facts are there for those who dare to face them.

Note, for example, Jewish writer Eli N. Evans, who came from a distinguished Southern Jewish family that had been active in liberal political affairs. In his 2005 Free Press book, *The Provincials: A Personal History of Jews in the South*, Evans has a very revealing discussion of the attitude by the Jewish community in Birmingham, Alabama toward Martin Luther King, Jr.'s activities. Evans wrote:

For months, King had led an economic boycott on the downtown which had all but destroyed the Jewish store owners, effectively blocking Negro trade and frightening off the Whites from the most elegant stores—Pizitz's, Loveman's—not to mention the less fancy shops selling work clothes and pegged pants, all being driven out of business.

So although, today, we remember the brutality of the "white racist" Birmingham police under the infamous "Bull" Connor, the truth is that—behind the scenes—wealthy Jewish businessmen were actually a driving force working against Dr. King.

But except for casual (and certainly very few) references such as this, cited above, the bigger historical record carefully ignores the hard-core financial realities that made Dr. King particularly odious to the Jewish economic (and political) elite not only in the "White South" (which is always denigrated by the Jewish-controlled mass media in referencing Dr. King's story) but all across the United States.

Likewise, Americans have long been treated to endless accounts in the Jewish-controlled mass media of the FBI's now-widely known (but initially quite secret) surveillance (and harassment) of Dr. King.

But even that legendary matter is wrapped in a mantle of misinformation and misdirection that—when carefully unveiled—demonstrates that the filthy fingerprints of Jewish intrigue can be found all over the matter.

For the historical record, let's take a closer look at the matter. It's not likely that you're going to find this information anywhere else. Many sources won't talk about it because they don't like Martin Luther

King (for one reason or another). Others won't want to talk about it precisely because it presents the Jews and their agenda in a less than positive light. In any case, here are the facts . . .

First of all, keep in mind that the now-infamous stories of Dr. King's adultery and sexual shenanigans (often cited by his critics) were first revealed in a May 25, 1968 column—published after King's assassination—by influential Washington-based nationally-syndicated columnist Drew Pearson and his junior henchman, Jack Anderson.

The story of how that column came to be published—bringing embarrassment to the King family and shame to King's reputation and his memory—is most revealing.

In 2010, a former associate of Jack Anderson, Mark Feldstein (who happens to be Jewish) published an eye-opening book about Anderson entitled *Poisoning the Press* (published by Farrar, Straus & Giroux). In that book, Feldstein pointed out that the now-infamous Pearson-Anderson column (referenced above) had its origins in FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's hatred for both the then-dead Dr. King and for Sen. Robert F. Kennedy who was then running for the Democratic presidential nomination, only to be assassinated himself less than two months later.

Although Hoover hated Pearson and Anderson—and vice-versa—the Washington duo allowed Hoover to use their column to vent his vengeance against both King and Kennedy. It was—as we shall see—a tangled web indeed, and one directly implicating the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, the eminent Jewish "civil rights" group.

The column in question reported that Kennedy—during his previous service as attorney general under his brother, President Kennedy—had ordered the FBI to spy on King and that FBI wiretapes of King revealed that the respected minister was engaged in extramarital affairs both here and abroad.

As Feldstein noted, FBI Director Hoover—using the egis of Pearson and Anderson and their widely-read column—was "simultaneously able to wound Kennedy's presidential campaign and besmirch the martyred civil rights leader's moral character."

In fact, this was, according to Feldstein, "the first time" that King's adultery was brought to the attention of the American public, despite the fact that Hoover had repeatedly sought to induce numerous other members of the Washington press corps to bring the story out.

However, Feldstein notes, "such sensational gossipmongering was still anathema to the mainstream media," and—until Pearson and Anderson's "leak"—the story of King's private life (and the facts about FBI spying on King) had remained unpublished.

Furthermore, the Pearson-Anderson column was not based on facts. The truth was that Robert Kennedy was pressured—essentially blackmailed—by J. Edgar Hoover into ordering the FBI to investigate Dr. King against Kennedy's better judgment (and political instincts).

According to Feldstein, Hoover had a hold over Robert Kennedy in that the then-attorney general knew that Hoover had extensive material in his own files about President Kennedy's own philandering and he thus gave in to the pressure. Feldstein wrote:

Grateful for their scoop, Pearson and Anderson uncritically parroted the FBI's false claim that Kennedy, not Hoover, was the driving force behind the King spying.

Now, of course, Pearson and Anderson (who were not particularly friendly to the Kennedy family and never had been) didn't care about this point one way or the other, and it wasn't until years later (after Hoover and Pearson were both dead) that Jack Anderson corrected the record and admitted that it was Hoover who was the prime mover behind the FBI's spying on (and harassment of) King.

But, at the time, in 1968, the revelations rocked the republic. Robert Kennedy's image and that of King were both tarnished. In fact, Pearson himself relished the opportunity to savage King, according to Feldstein who noted that: "Despite his support for civil rights, Pearson wanted to find a way to publish the juicy story to show that King was not superhuman."

Now here is what is particularly interesting—and this may make many folks who have parroted the Hoover-Pearson-Anderson stories about King's sexual misconduct a bit red in the face. In a footnote buried in the back of his book, Feldstein reveals something that has largely been lost in all of the writing and rhetoric about "the FBI and Martin Luther King" coming from both King's many admirers and his many detractors:

Hoover's deputy William Sullivan later told Jack Anderson's legman Les Whitten that it may have been one of King's associates, not the famous orator himself, whose similar-sounding voice was recorded making the most profane comments on FBI wiretaps. Similarly, a later FBI investigation concluded that it was "someone in King's party other than King" who "was involved with some prostitutes in the hotel in Oslo." (According to . . . another account, the hookers performed sexual favors for King's associates on condition of getting to sleep with King himself, only to be deprived of that honor.)

So the "truth" about King's adultery may not even be precisely what the general public has been led to believe. And a careful consideration of Drew Pearson's largely-forgotten record provides us further understanding of why this ostensibly "liberal" columnist would be ready to use his considerable public credibility to smear Dr. King. In fact, Pearson—who was of Jewish extraction on one side of his family—had long been a willing collaborator with the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith.

According to Oliver Pilat, Pearson's friendly biographer, "Over the years the ADL had helped Pearson enormously. It had provided information he could not obtain elsewhere, backed his lecture tours, even assisted in the circulation of his weekly newsletter."

Pearson's own former mother-in-law, *Washington Times-Herald* publisher Cissy Patterson—an outspoken anti-Semite who once threw ADL representatives out of her office when they came there to threaten her after she published material to which the ADL objected—once published an editorial attack on Pearson, calling him "both undercover agent and mouthpiece for the Anti-Defamation League."

My own long-time publisher, Willis Carto, had inside knowledge about Pearson's relationship with the ADL. In his book, *An Appeal to Reason* (published by *The Barnes Review* in 2009) Carto wrote:

[Pearson] had a profitable deal with the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith which was then—as today—organized everywhere. The deal was that they would back him if he would promote their projects and attack any of their perceived enemies. Thus, the ADL was able to get Drew's column carried in some 400 newspapers around the country.

How do I know about Drew's secret deal with the ADL? Well, that's an interesting story in and of itself.

You see, Drew's legman was John Henshaw, a hardworking journalist. When Drew needed some facts about someone or something (even though facts were not Drew's speciality) he would assign John to get them. During these jaunts . . . the ADL paid for John's transportation and expenses whereas Drew took care of John's salary.

However, John Henshaw was really an honest man and he finally got fed up with Pearson and quit.

He then came to Liberty Lobby and applied for a job and I brought him aboard to write for Liberty Lobby and *The Washington Observer* newsletter. That proved to be a smart move because John was a great reporter. And he loved working

for an honest publication. He had great contacts and came up with great stories. John told me much about Drew—including the story of Drew's secret deal with the ADL.

Now all of that having been said, we now know for a fact that the ADL did indeed have an axe to grind with Martin Luther King and this certainly explains why Drew Pearson played the primary front-line role in helping smear King's reputation.

In 2007 the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) rushed out a retrospective "case study" on "the dangers of domestic spying by federal law enforcement."

While the ACLU report did demonstrate the dangers of the FBI being used for politically-motivated domestic surveillance of American citizens, the report failed to mention one particularly interesting item: the fact that we now know—on the record—that much of the surveillance of King (and others) was actually being carried out by the ADL which then turned the illicit data its agents obtained over to the FBI.

In fact, this type of collaboration between J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI and the ADL went back to pre-World War II years when the ADL conducted black-bag operations against critics of President Franklin Roosevelt's efforts to embroil the United States in World War II.

ADL spy data was actually used by the Roosevelt Justice Department to bring trumped up "sedition" charges—later rightfully thrown out of court—against some 30 innocent Americans whose only real crime had been to criticize Jewish intrigues designed to get the U.S. into the war. (See an entire chapter in my book, *The Judas Goats*, for the sordid story.)

In any case, the first public revelation that the ADL had been spying on King came in the April 28, 1993 issue of *The San Francisco Weekly*—a liberal "alternative" journal—which reported:

During the civil rights movement, when many Jews were taking the lead in fighting against racism, the ADL was spying on Martin Luther King and passing on the information to J. Edgar Hoover, a former ADL employee said.

"It was common and casually accepted knowledge," said Henry Schwarzschild, who worked in the publications department of the ADL between 1962 and 1964.

"They thought King was sort of a loose cannon," said Schwarzschild. "He was a Baptist preacher and nobody could be quite sure what he would do next. The ADL was very anxious about having an unguided missile out there."

The fact the ADL was targeting King surprised many, especially since King is often praised by the ADL, particularly in its publications aimed at Black audiences.

But there's more. It turns out that the ADL was also engaged in heavy-duty spying on other Black civil rights leaders, not just King. The 1995 release of previously classified FBI documents—relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the Warren Commission investigation which followed—uncovered other ADL intrigue against famed Black comic and political activist Dick Gregory (a close friend of Dr. King) who had, as a sideline, become involved as an independent investigator into the JFK assassination. Again, those records showed that it was the ADL that was monitoring Gregory and that the ADL would then provide its spy data to the FBI.

So the whole ugly story of "the FBI and Martin Luther King" is more appropriately remembered as the story of "the ADL and Martin Luther King"—and *you won't find the story told anywhere but here. There are too many people with too many different agendas—some of them intersecting—who would prefer to ignore these facts.*

Considering all of this, it is probably appropriate to note for the historical record that there is very real evidence to suggest that Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad—the ADL's foreign principal—did have some role in the assassination of Dr. King.

The truth is that a key player in the King assassination has been linked to a key figure in the JFK assassination conspiracy. Both, in turn, have been firmly connected to joint involvement in a U.S.-based arms smuggling operation intimately tied to the Mossad.

This revelation appears in the book, *An Act of State*, by Dr. William E. Pepper, which—unless something more explosive comes along—will probably be the last word on the subject of who killed King and why.

Based on Pepper's investigations (working in conjunction with the King family) in his long-time role as the attorney for King's accused assassin, James Earl Ray, *An Act of State* does not trumpet the Mossad connection by any means.

However, Pepper's circumspect reference to the Mossad is a lightning bolt of recall to anyone who had already read my own book, *Final Judgment*, the first book ever to not only document a Mossad role in the JFK affair, but to also raise the likelihood of possible Israeli (and perhaps even ADL) involvement in the King assassination.

Pepper's assertion involving the Mossad is based on statements made to one of Pepper's investigators by former Colonel John Downie of the 902nd Military Intelligence Group, a unit based inside the Department of Defense.

According to Downie, the mysterious figure "Raul"—whom King's accused assassin, Ray, claimed had helped frame him (Ray) for King's murder—was part of a U.S.-based international arms smuggling operation (operating, in part, in Texas) that Pepper had already determined—through other sources—involved Jack Ruby, the Dallas nightclub keeper who killed JFK's accused assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald.

The link between "Raul" and Ruby was by no means tenuous, as some might suggest: In fact, "Raul" and Ruby were placed together by Pepper's sources on numerous occasions *prior* to the JFK assassination—five years before King's murder in 1968.

The smuggling operation linking "Raul" and Ruby utilized weapons stolen from U.S. Army bases and armories which were delivered to the New Orleans-based Carlos Marcello organized crime organization which, in turn, delivered those arms for sale in Latin and South America and elsewhere. The proceeds from the arms deals were reportedly split equally, with the U.S. 902nd Military Intelligence Group using its cut for financing covert, off-budget operations.

Here is the Mossad connection: Downie said that one of the individuals—a key player in this operation—was "a senior Mossad agent working in South America who acted as a senior liaison to the U.S. military and CIA."

It appears *Final Judgment* had almost certainly pinpointed the identity of the individual described by Pepper's source. In *Final Judgment*, I pointed out that the famous "umbrella man" who was photographed in Dealey Plaza in Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963 bore a remarkable resemblance to no less than the now-infamous (but then shadowy) long-time Mossad figure, Michael Harari.

In 1963, Harari was in the field as a top Mossad assassinations specialist and would have assuredly been in Dallas if, as *Final Judgment* contends, the Mossad was a prime player in the JFK conspiracy. In addition, the published record documents that—throughout his career—Harari was heavily involved in Israeli intelligence operations in Mexico, South America and the Caribbean, culminating in his later more widely-publicized role as the top advisor to then-Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega, who was ultimately toppled in a U.S. invasion.

Was Harari, then, the "senior Mossad agent working in South America" referenced by Pepper's source? If not, it was certainly someone Harari worked closely with (and was probably directing).

In fact, there are other strange Israeli connections swirling around the King assassination that have received little attention ...

In his earlier book on the King assassination, *Orders to Kill*, William Pepper described the background of Canadian Eric Galt, whose identity

James Earl Ray adopted during his wide-ranging travels. Galt, it seems, ran a warehouse that housed a top secret munitions project funded by the CIA, the U.S. Naval Surface Weapons Center, and the Army Electronics Research and Development Command. The work involved the production and storage of 'proximity fuses' used in surface-to-air missiles and artillery shells.

In August 1967, Pepper reported, Galt was "cooperating with another 902 [Military Intelligence Group] operation that involved the theft of some of these proximity fuses and their covert delivery to Israel." According to Pepper, he (Pepper) obtained "a confidential memorandum issued by the 902nd MIG on 17 October 1967 which confirms and discusses this operation, Project MEXPO, which was defined as a 'military material exploitation project of the Scientific and Technical Division (S&T) ... in Israel.'"

And as those who have read *Final Judgment* know well, my book asserted that it was JFK's determined effort to stop Israel from building nuclear weapons that was the primary motive by Israel to lend its expertise to the JFK assassination conspiracy.

So through means by which are still today a mystery; the "patsy" in the King assassination was using the identity of an individual who had ties to Israel and its "scientific and technical" research—which, of course, points in the direction of nuclear development.

Note, likewise, that Galt was linked to the "scientific and technical division" in Israel. So even in the King assassination—as in the JFK assassination before it—we again find an Israeli nuclear connection, although most researchers into those assassinations are loathe (or fearful) of mentioning that very interesting fact.

It is also a matter of record (but seldom mentioned) that prior to the King assassination, Ray had been given two numbers by his handler, "Raul," that Raul indicated Ray might contact if necessary. Ray later determined that the New Orleans number was that of the Laventhol Marine Supply company; and in his little-mentioned, self-written early appeal of his conviction, Ray asserted that "the resident listed in New Orleans was, among other things, an agent of a Mid-East organization distressed because of King's reported, forthcoming, before his death, public support of the Palestinian Arab cause." Of course, Ray was referring to the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith.

Later, when Ray testified before the House Assassinations Committee he referred to this number and commented, "I don't want to get into this libel area again and say something that might be embarrassing to—disservice some group or organizations ... he [King] intended, like Vietnam, to support the Arab cause ... someone in his organiza-

tion making contact with the Palestinians for an alliance." Again, Ray was obviously talking about King taking a stand that would upset the ADL, although he was talking around the subject without stating it directly.

Now setting aside the whole "conspiracy" angle relating to the ADL and the Jewish community (and Israeli intelligence) vis-a-vis the assassination of Dr. King, one thing remains clear: King was not so beloved by the Jews as they would have us believe. And that is certainly something worth noting for an accurate historical record.

Thus, despite the obvious (although largely well-hidden) distaste for Dr. King within the Jewish community, Jews have energetically worked to diminish growing criticism of Israel (and Jews) by African-Americans by claiming that King was a fervent supporter of Israel and a critic of those who were critical of Israel.

Jewish sources frequently publicize with much hullabaloo a purported "Letter to an Anti-Zionist Friend" by King regarding the matter of "anti-Zionism" and "anti-Semitism." The alleged letter read in part:

... You declare, my friend, that you do not hate the Jews, you are merely 'anti-Zionist.' And I say, let the truth ring forth from the high mountain tops, let it echo through the valleys of God's green earth: When people criticize Zionism, they mean Jews—this is God's own truth.

Antisemitism ... has been and remains a blot on the soul of mankind. In this we are in full agreement. So know also this: anti-Zionist is inherently antisemitic, and ever will be so ...

The antisemite rejoices at any opportunity to vent his malice. The times have made it unpopular, in the West, to proclaim openly a hatred of the Jews.

This being the case, the antisemite must constantly seek new forms and forums for his poison. How he must revel in the new masquerade! He does not hate the Jews, he is just 'anti-Zionist'! My friend, I do not accuse you of deliberate antisemitism ... But I know you have been misled—as others have been—into thinking you can be 'anti-Zionist' and yet remain true to these heartfelt principles that you and I share.

Let my words echo in the depths of your soul: When people criticize Zionism, they mean Jews—make no mistake about it.

Now here are some cold, hard facts. On January 22, 2002 the rabidly pro-Israel Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America (CAMERA) published a special alert to its readers on its Internet website at camera.org declaring "Letter by Martin Luther King a Hoax" and stated flatly that the letter was "apparently a hoax."

Although this letter by King is purported to have appeared in an August, 1967 edition of *The Saturday Review*, the truth is that no letters from King appear in any of the four editions of the *Review* published in August of 1967. And while others claimed the statement appeared in a book entitled *This I Believe: Selections from the Writings of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.*, there is no evidence that such a book was ever published. It is not listed, in any way, in a bibliography of books and materials by and about King that is available from the Martin Luther King Center for Social Change in Atlanta.

Yet, despite this, note some of the powerful Jewish polemicists who have exploited this forgery to enforce pro-Israel political correctness within the Black community:

- Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon quoted the "letter" before the Israeli parliament on January 26, 2005;

- Michael Salberg of the Anti-Defamation (ADL) of B'nai B'rith cited this non-existent "letter" in his July 31st, 2001 testimony before the U.S. House of Representative's International Relations Committee's Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights;

- Mortimer Zuckerman, billionaire publisher of *U.S. News & World Report* (then-president of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations) quoted the "letter" in a column on September 17, 2001;

- Ex-Soviet dissident-turned-hardline Israeli extremist Natan Sharansky cited the "letter" in a November 2003 article in *Commentary*, the neo-conservative journal of the American Jewish Committee;

- Rabbi Marc Shneier cited the "letter" in a book *Shared Dreams*, which happened to include a preface from Dr. King's son;

And last but far from least, Abraham Foxman—the much-quoted national director of the ADL—has cited King's supposed rhetoric in his 2003 book, *Never Again? The Threat of the New Anti-Semitism*, as well as in multiple of his own speeches and commentaries including one published in *The Washington Post* on August 7, 2001;

And, needless to say, many other people have also cited King's statement, relying on what they have seen from such sources above.

Now although the aforementioned CAMERA rushed to assure its readers that while the purported King "letter" was a hoax, CAMERA still asserted that other sources did say that they had indeed heard King express such sentiments and that King did consider anti-Zionism to be anti-Semitism. *But there's more to the story ...*

CAMERA cited pro-Israel Jewish publicist Seymour Martin Lipset who claimed that King had made such remarks at a private dinner in Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1968 which Lipset cited in a 1969 article in

Encounter magazine. And Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.) has claimed that King had made the remarks in a 1968 speech at "Harvard" (which is in Cambridge) where King supposedly said:

... You declare, my friend, that you do not hate the Jews, you are merely "anti-Zionist." ... When people criticize Zionism, they mean Jews... And what is anti-Zionist? It is the denial to the Jewish people of a fundamental right that we justly claim for the people of Africa and freely accord all other nations of the Globe. ... When people criticize Zionism, they mean Jews—make no mistake about it."

However, here's the problem. This excerpt from the alleged speech at "Cambridge" or "Harvard" sounds remarkably like the previously-cited rhetoric from the phony letter.

But more importantly—and note this: there are no records in Stanford University's archives of Dr. King's work indicating that King having given any formal speeches in Cambridge or nearby Boston during that time frame.

Even further, *The Harvard Crimson* reported on April 8, 1968 (after King's death) that King had not been to Cambridge since April 23, 1967—well before the "dinner" cited only by the Jewish publicist and well before the 1968 "speech" cited (many years after the "fact") by the congressman (who happens to be one of the *few* Black members of the House of Representatives who is a *firm* ally of the Jewish Lobby).

So there is very real doubt about even these supposedly pro-Zionist words from Dr. King—wherever or whenever they were supposed made by the civil rights leader.

The liberal website Counterpunch (at counterpunch.org) has published an authoritative report on "The Use and Abuse of Martin Luther King Jr. by Israel's Apologists." The authors, Fadi Kiblawi and Will Youmans, have summarized the ugly history of the exploitation of Dr. King's legacy by pro-Israel propagandists.

And despite the fact—as history has recorded—King made many public pronouncements over many years and in many locations, the pro-Zionist propagandists are unable to cite any other references such as those false "quotations" that have been so thoroughly disseminated.

And to this day still, Dr. King's famous (but non-existent) "Letter to an Anti-Zionist Friend" still remains in widespread circulation on the Internet—even long after the pro-Israel CAMERA reported it was a hoax.

Even today in the realm of race relations—a point that surprises many people who believe Jewish claims about the supposed front-line

role of Jewish groups in "civil rights" activism—the record shows that Jews have, quite in stark contrast, energetically fought programs supported, on the whole, by African-Americans, the Jewish groups lining up right alongside the Ku Klux Klan and "white supremacist" spokesmen.

The aforementioned Jewish writer, Eric L. Goldstein, asserts that "most" Jews oppose programs such as affirmative action, especially when they include the use of specific racial quotas. In his book, *The Price of Whiteness*, Goldstein revealed that:

In 1977 three of the leading American Jewish organizations—the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith—submitted friends-of-the-court briefs in support of the case of Alan Bakke, a white student, who was denied admission to the medical school at the University of California at Davis.

According to Goldstein, "the Jewish establishment supported Bakke not only because the notion of ethnic and racial quotas cut against their classical liberal ideology of integration, but because it also held the potential to harm Jewish applicants to colleges and universities, thereby limiting the continued success of American Jews."

Now all of this taken together—anti-Black rhetoric published in Jewish newspapers, the open support for slavery and the slave trade (not to mention substantial Jewish involvement therein), coupled with the use (and abuse) of Dr. Martin Luther King—simply adds another level to the matter of the Jewish insistence upon their superiority and chosenness above all others.

And particularly today, when America is rent with racial divisiveness, at a time when the Jews (as a group) portray themselves as being above it all and working for togetherness, it is appropriate and critical that we call attention to the facts—facts that demonstrate beyond any question that when it comes to the matter of "civil rights" the Jewish attitude toward Blacks is no different than the point of view they have historically expressed to all others.

So—considering the record—we can hardly be surprised that Black Americans are among those (at least according to Jewish sources) reflecting a certain amount of so-called "anti-Semitism." In the case of the Blacks—still smarting from slavery and discrimination—they are only responding, in kind, to the Jews just as many other peoples of all races and creeds have done throughout the recorded history of mankind.

In short, if the Jews want to put an end to "anti-Semitism," then they had better soon stop their own "anti-" attitudes toward all others.

Your Neighbor, the Anti-Semite . . .

Many people believe that extreme anti-Jewish opinions are the consequences of bad personal experiences. That is, if you were personally screwed over by a Jew sometime in your life, you have jumped to the quite unjustified conclusion that all Jews are, therefore, bad.

No doubt that sort of thing does happen, but that really is not the foundation of most anti-Jewish opinions. If one examines the ideological foundations of most anti-Semites, one finds that their anti-Semitism arises from an informed reading of the Jewish impression upon history.

It is not infrequent to find hardened anti-Semites who regularly buy from Jewish retailers because they appreciate the quality of the merchandise. Thus the extrapolation from bad personal experiences simply does not hold up in most cases.

Contrary to the stereotype, most anti-Semites are not ignorant, uneducated types. Far from it. A significant proportion of them have read very widely. Much of their information comes from Jewish reference works or from reputable academic studies. They are not intellectual lightweights and they are not arguing from ignorance. It is fashionable to dismiss anti-Jewish opinions as "prejudice" because it avoids the necessity of rationally examining an alternative but exceedingly well-documented interpretation of history.

The anti-Semite has great difficulty finding an outlet for his views. This is not surprising. A well-educated anti-Semite will quickly destroy the stereotype of psychopathic prejudice if given the opportunity to present his case. That is why he is never given the opportunity.

Anti-Semitism does not flourish in public where it can lead to instant career destruction and social ostracism. But it flourishes behind the scenes where people can read some shocking, but very well documented, facts on their computer screens.

The anti-Semite is not what he seems. He does not make bombs in his garage or plot to assassinate his Jewish neighbor. But he does earnestly desire to make known information of the kind which might reorient thinking minds to a problem of which most of them are only vaguely aware.

—This brilliant essay by Yancy Ames was published by Dr. Harrell Rhome in his *Eagle Newsletter* in the Jan-Feb 2005 edition. For more by Dr. Rhome, write: PO Box 6303, Corpus Christie, Texas 78466 or email: EagleRevisionist@aol.com.

CHAPTER FIVE

Are the Jews Really "Jews"? A Question that Only God Can Answer

While there are many differing points of view by Christians toward the Jews, the fact is that there are a host of forthright Christian pastors in America today who have dared to stand up to the Zionist agenda and call out the Jews for their attitudes and their practices, daring to demonstrate that "those who say they are Jews but who are not" have been party to a historic religious (and political) fraud upon mankind.

The dual and inter-related questions of "Who is a Jew?"—which continues to be a topic of debate in the Jewish community both in Israel and worldwide—and precisely where the Jews originated in the first place constitute a troublesome matter that must be addressed if we are to have a full understanding of this issue called "anti-Semitism."

In short, while we have a group of people operating today as "Jews" and proclaiming themselves superior to all others, we shall see in the pages that follow that the truth is that there is really no firm evidence that there is a Jewish "people"—at least those whose history is supposedly recounted in the Old Testament.

And what that means, quite simply, is that the old saw about the Jews—however the Jews may be defined—being "God's Chosen People" is doubtful at best, and, in a more direct sense, it also means that the people who today call themselves "Jews" have no historic claim to the Holy Land we refer to as "Israel."

In the May/June 2010 issue of *The Barnes Review*—of which I was responsible for preparing as "guest editor"—my longtime associate Willis Carto put forth his remarkable thesis (founded on very real evidence coming from a wide variety of sources) that the actual history of the Jewish people could be traced back to the early Neanderthal.

Carto's pivotal essay, "Revenge of the Neanderthal" outlined this scenario in no uncertain terms. And it's important to point out, for the record, that at least two others who claim that modern Jewry, at least in part, can trace its origins to the Neanderthal both happen to be of Jewish extraction themselves: Welsh-based sociologist and researcher Stan Gooch and Canadian-based writer Michael Bradley.

Gooch's books, *The Dream Culture of the Neanderthals: Guardians of Ancient Wisdom* and *The Neanderthal Legacy: Remembering Our Genetic and Cultural Origins*, and Bradley's two works, *The Iceman Inheritance* and its sequel, *Chosen People from the Caucasus*, expand upon the theories the two writers put forth, but, quite notably, the authors differ vigorously in their ultimate conclusions.

Put simply, Gooch looks favorably on what he perceives to be the Neanderthal origins of the Jews whereas Bradley sees the Neanderthal connection as a very real, but an ultimately unfortunate, explanation for many of the geopolitical and social problems facing the world today.

In truth, scientific inquiry into the origins of mankind (and most specifically into the saga of the Neanderthals) is an ongoing process and even as that issue of *The Barnes Review* was going to press, there were new revelations about the ancient history of man that lent strong credence to the idea that the Jews are indeed a very different group of people whose possible—no, let us say it: “likely”—origin among the Neanderthals would certainly explain the age-old struggle between the Jews and the non-Jews. There are no simple answers and one can find spirited debate among those who make that study their business.

So there is nobody who can come forward and say definitively that either Gooch or Bradley’s assessments are off the mark or to disprove the possibility (which others have put forth) that the Neanderthals and Cro-Magnon man (the presumed forerunner of what we today refer to as “modern” man) may have actually interbred and produced a “new man,” despite the fact that others contend that the Neanderthals were, more or less, an unlucky branch of the human family tree that died out.

Consider, too, the fact that on April 19, 1991 the prestigious *Science* magazine reported that in Israel itself there were four caves in which the remains of Neanderthals were found and that newly developed dating techniques suggested that “modern types and the Neanderthals were contemporaries on the Israeli landscape.” So there were Neanderthals in the Holy Land.

In his *History of the Jews*, even Abram Leon Sachar—hailed as the foremost modern historian of the Jewish people—wrote of excavations in ancient Palestine that “reveal the presence, among the earliest inhabitants, of a race of new stone age men who dwelt in caves and grottoes and burnt their dead in crude crematoriums, and who may have been the Horim of the Biblical narrative.”

Yet, he noted, “how long they lived on in Palestine cannot be ascertained.” Sachar likewise acknowledged that the early history of the Jews is not so precisely documented as many might wish to think.

Discussing this problem in assessing the ambiguities of what is generally known as “Jewish” history, Sachar acknowledged frankly: “... a veil now falls over the story. We are left without definite evidence of what occurred during these long centuries of race movements and conflicts. ... The details of the shifting and changing are unknown.”

In fact, Sachar added—almost as if unable to define anything whatsoever as *authentic* Jewish history:

When the veil is at last lifted, five centuries later, and zealous historians begin to tell, in the Biblical narrative, the story of their ancestors, the Hebrews are already long settled in Palestine, holding the strategic places, loosely united in a monarchy, worshipping a strange god, known as Yahweh.

Where they came from, who molded them into a people, how they entered Palestine, their oldest traditions we cannot answer with certainty.

Sachar admitted that what he calls “the most influential history in the world”—that is, the history of the Jews—“is lost in the gray morning of folk-memory and fable.”

So it is that even the most eminent of modern Jewish historians affirmed that what he called the “central problem” of early Hebrew history was, as he put it, to “explain how a group of scattered tribes, pressing into the country from many directions, became a nation, and how their varied religious experiences evolved into the national religion which the prophets built upon and expanded.”

In short, Sachar was saying then—as even more current Jewish historians such as Shlomo Sand have pointed out (to much furor, it seems)—that what is said to be Jewish “history” is really, in substantial part, what the authors of the Old Testament *claimed* to be history, but which others—including Jewish (even Israeli) historians, archeologists and other scholars—say is nonsense that is *contradicted by scientific and historical fact*. In short, it’s bunk.

Another Jewish writer, Dan Rottenberg, in his widely utilized work, *Finding Our Fathers: A Guidebook to Jewish Genealogy*, is careful to delineate the complexities of tracing Jewish ancestry and points out, quite candidly:

Many traditions about ancestral descent, Jewish and otherwise, have been handed down over centuries and even millennia. Because they have survived for so long, they are often accepted as truth. It’s fun to consider these traditions and impossible to say flat out that they are false, but at the very least they are highly suspect. If you examine any such tradition closely, you will find that the people maintaining it had some particular axe to grind.

For example, Rottenberg notes that in the 19th century many Jews living in Hungary readily claimed descent from the famous Khazars (non-Jewish converts to Judaism)—more about whom in a moment.

Noting that "perhaps" the claim was valid, Rottenberg adds that the claim also happened to be "very convenient in an age when Hungarian nationalism was strong and suspicion of outsiders widespread." By claiming Khazar origins, the Jews of Hungary were thus able to say that they were not really from a faraway land, but people from the same land as the Magyars.

On the other hand, Rottenberg points out, there is a problem for modern-day "Jews" living in the state of Israel: "If it could be shown that a major part of the world's Jews were descended from the Khazars, and not from the ancient Israelites, this might seem to some people to undercut the Jews' claim to Israel as their rightful homeland."

So there is no "certain" history of the Jews and their origins, even in more modern times. And thus to even attempt to explore their earliest evolution and their separation into a group that we know today as "the Jewish people," reminds us there are no simple answers—as even Jewish historians acknowledge.

And at this juncture, we must address the issue of the aforementioned "Khazars" who have become the subject of much discussion among modern day critics of Israel who contend that because (so the story goes) so many people today known as "Jews" are actually descendants of a tribe from the Caucasus who converted to Judaism (and many of whose descendants ultimately settled in Palestine) this is an argument against those "Jews" having a right to occupy that land.

The argument is made that most of the Jews of today—who had their origins in Eastern Europe and are known as "Ashkenazim"—are descended from the Khazars and that the Sephardic (or "Oriental") Jews of the Middle East, some will say, are "the real Jews" who ostensibly have a claim to Palestine. But it's not really that simple.

This group of people known as the Khazars were hardly ever the subject of discussion outside scholarly circles—except those interested in Jewish history—until the release in 1976 of a controversial book entitled *The Thirteenth Tribe* by Jewish philosopher and social critic Arthur Koestler (1905-1983). This book explored the history of the Khazars and dared to raise the question as to whether the fact of Jewish ancestry tracing back to the Khazars could indeed give people today strong reason to question the Jewish claim on Palestine.

However, independent of Koestler—whose work he had never before known—the aforementioned Canadian-based writer of Jewish origins, Michael Bradley, released his own 1978 work, *The Iceman Inheritance*, followed up by its sequel, *Chosen People From the Caucasus*, in which (combined together) he put forth his thesis that the modern day people known as the Jews were descended, at least in part,

from the Khazars and that, further, the Khazars could trace their origins back to the Neanderthals. And in subsequent writings and research, Bradley has gone even further, pointing out that Neanderthal origins of the Jewish people be traced likewise to the sands of the Middle East.

What makes Bradley's work so vital is that, in many ways, it helps us understand that, yes, Jews are different, and that they think differently from non-Jews. (A point that is most definitely "not polite" to admit.)

And because of the apparent likelihood that Jews have indeed been spawned from a different genetic line, we can thus understand why there has always been a significant conflict between Jews and non-Jews. People—all people—are different and in the case of the Jews, it seems that they are particularly different.

Bradley's website (at michaelbradley.info) provides a fascinating overview of some of what he has concluded:

In *Chosen People from the Caucasus*, Bradley focuses on the two separate groups of people who came from the Caucasus Mountains of the Middle East: the Biblical Hebrews who emerged from the southern Caucasus between 3000-2000 BC to invade Palestine, and the northern Caucasus "Khazars" who were converted to Judaism about 740 A.D.

The Khazars were pushed into Central and Eastern Europe by Mongol invasions, and their descendants comprise the vast majority of modern Jewry, a point that some historians, both Jewish and non-Jewish have quibbled over, some suggesting that only a small number of both peoples, ironically, are considered to be "Jews"—although they have no direct historical or genetic connections with each other—except as they shared a Neanderthal origin in the Caucasus Mountains in the far distant and ancient pre-Judaic past.

Bradley contends that people and cultures emerging from the Caucasus Mountains (a known refuge of late-lingering Neanderthal populations) in proto-historical and historical times would have remained highly intelligent, highly aggressive and psychosexually maladapted (promoting a high level of in-group cohesion). These traits, Bradley contends, explain the survival of Biblical Hebrews against all odds and also the inordinate social influence of modern Western Jews.

Bradley contends that there is no mystique of "the chosen people." "Monotheism"—a purely male and abstract God-head—is merely a result of Neanderthal glacial physical and mental adaptations or "maladaptations."

Proven Neanderthal in-group cohesion and extreme aggression together resulted in a fiercely parochial "chosen people" perspective.

The cultural fusion of the two separate streams of "Jews" has, since the 16th century, played an important role in the evolution of Western Civilization and thus in the molding of the entire world's present cultural profile.

Bradley contends that a uniquely high level of lingering Neanderthal aggression, perpetuated by ethnic prohibitions against outside marriage, has been responsible for the major role played by those calling themselves Jews in the discovery and conquest of the Americas, the transatlantic trade in Black Africans as slaves and cultural colonization of non-Whites by the West. It has been a role too often distorted and disguised by loud lamentations of "anti-Semitism."

Bradley has written of certain physical traits, typically described as being "Jewish" which he contends are "vestigial Neanderthal ones":

... Generally a short stature and a plump physique, many very short wide-hipped and big-breasted women, extremely hairy men and a tendency toward beetling brows and large beaky "hooked" noses in both genders. Many Ashkenazim have crinkly-curly head hair tending toward dark reddish brown or mahogany in color.

Among Ashkenazi "Jews" there is also a genetic tendency toward beaky faces, not only just noses, and big mouths (in more ways than one) that "wrap around" the lower face. ... But these are not "Semitic" physical traits. They are Neanderthal physical characteristics.

However, Bradley said that the Neanderthal and Khazar heritage goes behind physical traits, suggesting that "maybe some Neanderthal emotional and behavioral traits persisted among the Ashkenazim along with the physical ones." He noted:

Their "chosen people" pretension is a typical Neanderthal in-group obsession that is actually a genetic racist predisposition against all other humans.

It is a genetically determined "us against them" mentality. Their higher level of known Neanderthal aggression against outsiders is responsible for their disproportional social influence wherever they have settled in the West. ...

The Ashkenazi Jews, as a group, exhibit lingering Neanderthal traits most strongly among living Caucasians because of Jewish prohibitions against marriage with outsiders. Their Neanderthal genes have been kept "all in the family", as it were. These Neanderthal genes were not diluted by intermarriage nearly as much as with most other Caucasians.

... This Russian steppe origin of today's Ashkenazi "Jews" was not just a "theory" based on squibs by medieval Christian, Moslem and Jewish chroniclers.

It was solid and objective historical reality based on linguistics and hard archaeological artifacts.

According to Bradley, the Neanderthal heritage of modern-day "Jews" explains much about their ongoing problems with not only the native people of Palestine but with other people on the planet. He writes:

This unfortunate combination of high aggression combined with a tendency toward emotional instability and hysteria when they feel nervous or threatened ... which is all the time when they are not in absolute control. And they are arrogant, but uneasy, even then. An ethnic symptom of this emotional instability is the Jewish tendency toward hypochondria. Even they cannot (yet) control death.

This unfortunate combination of high aggression combined with a tendency toward hysteria and emotional instability has proved to be a dangerous and tragic situation over the course of Western history. Their aggression encourages continual Jewish attempts to control societies, while the emotional instability makes it difficult for most Jews to distinguish reasonably between justified social criticism by their non-Jewish neighbors and attacks.

Insensitive even to objective concerns about inordinate Jewish influence in societies, and reacting with hysterical aggression to any such supposed "attack" on their behavior and pleas from non-Jews to limit it, Jews have always provoked violence against themselves. And then they, with much emotional satisfaction, feel victimized and attribute the situation to innate "anti-Semitism" among their neighbors.

On his website, in an essay entitled "A frightening publication history of Jewish media suppression," Bradley most revealingly describes the subsequent controversy that erupted when many media outlets (and

Jewish sources)—which had previously hailed his writing on the topic of the Neanderthals—came to realize that his work pointed toward Neanderthal origins for the Jewish people.

With all of this having been said, however, it is critical to point out that there have indeed been studies that have still suggested there are very real genetic ties between the supposedly “different” Ashkenazi Jews and the Sephardic Jews, the latter of whom are said by some to be “the real Jews” and who thus are said to have a “right” to Palestine.

This is a point that many people who freely discuss the matter of the Khazars (who are attributed as the ancestors of the Ashkenazi Jews) do not yet seem to fully understand.

In short, the bottom line is that so many people who denounce “the Khazars” as not being “real Jews” find themselves stepping into some historical and scientific quicksand, a mire from which there is no intellectual escape. The point is that there apparently is *no significant difference* between those two groups of “Jews” who assert their right to displace the Christian and Muslim Arab peoples from the Holy Land.

And the truth is that in Israel today, the Sephardic Jews are hardly the “good Jews” that many critics of Zionism and Israel want to believe. In fact, the Sephardic Jews are among the most hard-line and fanatic supporters of the extreme elements surrounding the Likud and Kadima parties which are closely linked to the dangerous “neo-conservative” Jewish elements operating in America today. And this is something that many well-meaning people fail to understand.

Now Michael Bradley (along with Willis Carto and Stan Gooch) are not the only voices raising serious questions about the origins of those whom today are generally known as “the Jews.”

A Jewish scholar, Shlomo Sand, a teacher of contemporary history at the University of Tel Aviv in Israel, rocked Israel with his best-selling Hebrew-language book, *The Invention of the Jewish People*, which is now available in English in mainstream U.S. bookstores.

Sand’s book is so provocative in that it demonstrates that virtually everything we think we know about the history of the Jews may just not be true, or, at the least, certainly not what many have held as an article of faith going back generations. And it underscores the point—so critical in political discussion today—that the Jews have no special claim on the land of Palestine.

Because of the intense interest that Sand’s book generated, his publisher set up a website on the Internet providing reviews of the book, commentaries relating to the controversy, and interviews with Sand. That website is inventionofthejewishpeople.com. On the site, the publishers provide an overview of Sand’s remarkable book which follows:

A historical tour de force that demolishes the myths and taboos that have surrounded Jewish and Israeli history, *The Invention of the Jewish People* offers a new account of both that demands to be read and reckoned with.

Was there really a forced exile in the first century, at the hands of the Romans?

Should we regard the Jewish people, throughout two millennia, as both a distinct ethnic group and a putative nation — returned at last to its Biblical homeland?

Shlomo Sand argues that most Jews actually descend from converts, whose native lands were scattered far across the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

The formation of a Jewish people and then a Jewish nation out of these disparate groups could only take place under the sway of a new historiography, developing in response to the rise of nationalism throughout Europe.

Beneath the biblical backfill of the nineteenth-century historians, and the twentieth-century intellectuals who replaced rabbis as the architects of Jewish identity, *The Invention of the Jewish People* uncovers a new narrative of Israel’s formation, and proposes a bold analysis of nationalism that accounts for the old myths.

The central importance of the conflict in the Middle East ensures that Sand’s arguments will reverberate well beyond the historians and politicians that he takes to task.

Without an adequate understanding of Israel’s past, capable of superseding today’s opposing views, diplomatic solutions are likely to remain elusive. In this iconoclastic work of history, Shlomo Sand provides the intellectual foundations for a new vision of Israel’s future.

And, in truth, what Sand has written is actually only the latest manifestation of a phenomenon that has come to be called “post-Zionism,” a growing body of work, even among Jewish scholars, archeologists, theologians and others who are openly questioning Jewish history (and, in particular, that of the Zionist movement and the state of Israel) even to the point of asking the dread question: “Do the Jews really have a historic right to Palestine?”

In a remarkable 2009 book—*Jewcentricity: Why the Jews Are Praised, Blamed, and Used to Explain Just About Everything* (published by John Wiley & Sons)—Jewish writer Adam Garfinkle, who has taught at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International

Studies, the University of Pennsylvania, Haverford College and Tel Aviv University, has described "post-Zionism":

Some Israeli archeologists have been on a mission to debunk the Hebrew Bible. A good example is *The Bible Unearthed: Archeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Its Sacred Texts*, a 2002 book by Tel Aviv University Professor Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman, a Belgian scholar. In this book the authors argue that the Torah is a brilliant 7th and 8th Century B.C.E. construction completed in the middle of the 5th Century B.C.E., that aimed to unify otherwise disparate peoples in the country.

There is no evidence of an exodus from Egypt, of a violent conquest of the land under Joshua, of a magnificent united kingdom under David and Solomon. There is evidence, in essence, that the Israelites were, in the main, Canaanites themselves, much of their religion taken from the general neighborhood to the north and east, particularly the ancient civilization at Ugarit.

Shlomo Sand has argued further that there never was a Rome-era exile and that the Palestinians who stayed put for the last eighteen centuries are to some extent the modern descendants of that era's Jews.

The Jews of today, he says, are largely converts picked up through the centuries, add-ons, a polyglot mass of people with little "blood" in common. Sand thinks that by arguing this line he is undermining the Zionist narrative.

Now, note, however, that Garfinkle does not buy Sand's argument, *per se*, but still suggests that the Jews are essentially "different" and that, well, yes, they *do* have a claim to Israel. Garfinkle asserts:

Even if [Sand] is right in historical scholarship, which is questionable, about Roman times, he is surely wrong about what it means. To repeat: Jews are not a race or an ethnicity so much as a people, a point that in no way undermines and in some ways strengthens the Jewish, and the Zionist, narrative.

So, in a sense, *Garfinkle says that history really doesn't matter*. The Jews can thus say what they want to say and determine "who is a Jew" and who isn't and still demand special recognition as "Jews" and the right to their own "homeland" on property that belonged, historically, to other people—that is, non Jews.

Another point to be considered about the development of those we know today as "Jews" is quite significant. And that is that it was precisely because of the Jewish religious teachings that a certain "people" emerged. That is, the religion known as "Judaism" was critical to framing the nature of Jewish society itself and—more importantly (in our context in these pages) the basic Jewish outlook toward the Goyim.

The late William Dudley Pelley was a successful American screenwriter in the early years of Hollywood who later turned to historical and religious research and, in the end, was fiercely persecuted—and then criminally prosecuted—for his outspoken publishings and pronouncements. [A full-length account of Pelley's efforts appeared in the March/April 2000 issue of *THE BARNES REVIEW*.]

One arena in which Pelley focused his efforts was a study of the Jewish people. And his assessments of their history are fully relevant and accurate today as they were when he first addressed the subject.

Pelley sought to answer the question: "How did the Jews come to have such strange traditions setting them apart, racially and religiously, from the gentiles?" Pelley summarized his findings insofar as the Jewish religious teachings (no matter what their origins) impacted upon the world of the Jews:

When Moses led the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, he is traditionally credited with having introduced a strange custom for the perpetuation of his one-God religious ideas and the priesthood that was intended to keep them alive in the hearts of the Israelites.

He laid it down as a law that the first-born son of every Hebrew family should be dedicated to the priestly calling, also that one-tenth of the resources of every family should be donated for the upkeep of such priesthood.

Now for one boy out of every family to be qualified as a priest, or "cohen" from which so many modern Jews get the surname Cohen—meant that over a long period of time the numbers of priests must become prodigious.

There were so many of them, in fact, that they came to be recognized as a caste, called Levites. Incidentally from Levites we get the many variations or names such as Levi, or Levy, that designate today's Jews.

These formidable numbers of priests came to make the Hebrews the worst priest-ridden people on the earth. They had to be supported, and anything that in any way threatened their priestly jobs, met with swift and fierce opposition.

The only way that they could preserve these jobs, was by enforcing a rigid solidarity and racial consciousness among the masses, and binding them tight to the priestly counsel. The only way such solidarity and racial consciousness could be created and maintained in turn, was to so interpret religion—or what passed for religion—that the populace could not perform the simplest acts of daily life without having the priestly interpretation of it, and making the people feel that such priests were indispensable. This was accomplished by training the people to think that they were "different," and thus creating the barrier between them and members of other races in consequence.

As the priests were likewise the only learned men, and in charge of the Israelite traditions, they could interject into those traditions what they pleased—if it only impressed upon their people a sense of the priestly importance, that they—the Israelites—were the truly great people and those beloved of the Creator, and that the priests were unchallenged leaders over them.

"Today we would term such monopoly a racket," commented Pelley, "because basically it was built on priestly gain and power. In other words, whatever enhanced the racial and spiritual solidarity of this people, enhanced the influence and indispensability of the priestly caste." Pelley added further:

In teaching the Israelites to think that they were "different" and "better," the priests were feathering their own nests and making their jobs sure-fire and profitable.

So Israelite—and later Jewish—traditions became what they are today. It is ingrained into Jews to think themselves "different," and "better," and the priest-rabbi now has such a hold over him that he cannot be a Jew without acknowledging the priest-rabbi influence in the most trivial of his daily acts.

So the Jews of today are orientals who have been kept politically intact throughout the earth by a clan consciousness derived from the peculiarities of their common Mosaic faith. Jews have crossbred with other races to such an extent that there is almost no such thing today as a pure-blooded Jew.

Pelley concluded that, "Anthropologically Jews are a racial hybrid, wherever we find him . . . It is the more nearly correct thing to say that the Jew is the follower of a religion . . . and any claim to membership in

a 'race' is spurious." Although, of course, we often find—as we have seen—that even the Jews have referred to themselves as a "race"—and a genetically and intellectually superior one at that!

Although there will forever be debate over the meanings of the words "Jewish" and "Jew" and "Judah" and even the word "Israel" as they are used in the Bible and in subsequent historical and religious teachings, and in modern usage itself, William Dudley Pelley also provided us an illustrative capsule overview providing a response to the question: To which branch of "the Jews" *did* Jesus Christ belong?

Pelley's answer is most enlightening and adds further to other scholarly research which does indeed suggest that Jesus Christ was not, in fact, a "Jew"—a point that would come as a disturbing surprise to many Christians who have, for generations been carefully taught and frequently reminded (by the Jews) that "Christ was a Jew" and that, therefore, the Jewish people were somehow beyond reproach. Pelley wrote:

Shocking as it becomes to modern Christians, an examination of the evidence now coming to light reveals that Jesus Christ was not a Jew or any other kind of an Israelite! This, of course, strikes at the very core and heart of present Christian doctrine. Nevertheless, sooner or later, Aryan Christians have got to face the facts. It takes a whole volume in itself to present these facts, but such a volume is available.

In the first place, the only true Jews are descendants of the Tribe of Judah, and even if Biblical bases be taken for argument, the New Testament says in a score of places that He emphatically did not come from that tribe. Christ was a Galilean. . . . Galilee got its name from the Gauls, brought down by the Assyrian king when he denuded the northern kingdom of Hebrews. The proper spelling of the word should be Gaulilee. Over and over, too, the New Testament writings speak of "Galilee of the gentiles." . . .

The genealogies of Christ in . . . two New Testament gospels do not determine the matter, since they do not agree, and since they do not agree, neither one of them can be established as authentic. Moreover, Jews reckoned genealogies through the father, always. Christians are confronted by the dilemma that if they make a tenet of their faith that Mary conceived Christ by the Holy Ghost, then she did not conceive Christ by Joseph her husband; and if she did not do the latter, then the Hebrew genealogies, tracing Jesus's ancestry back to David and Abraham, are fabrications.

Jesus did not speak the prevalent Jewish tongue of the period; He conversed in what was a gentile language. At no place did He Himself confirm that He was a Jew, and the words before Pilate, "Thou sayest!" were merely a colloquialism, not of acquiescence to Pilate's remark but of the thought: "You're doing the talking, I'm keeping quiet!"

Thus, the idea that Christ was a Jew has no real sound basis in historical (or religious) truth. And while that is another matter not generally considered a subject for "polite" discussion, there is another point that must be addressed, particularly as it relates to the thinking of so many modern-day Christians (especially those known as the "fundamentalists" and "dispensationalists," the latter in particular) who are found worshipping at the altar of the Jewish people and the state of Israel.

The remarkable fact is that—as we alluded to earlier—there are very significant trends in modern Jewish teachings which actually reject many of the foundational "truths" of the Old Testament. These trends are based not only on archeological and scientific findings that are emerging from the Holy Land itself, but also within the more broad-ranging framework of Jewish philosophical and theological teachings.

In other words, while "the Jews" continue to use the Bible as their claim to Palestine (that is, the state of Israel) and forever advance the theme that they are "God's Chosen People"—two points that many Christians believe to be "the gospel"—the Jews themselves actually don't even believe that the Bible is really "the word of God."

Note, for example, Michael Massing's article, "New Torah for Modern Minds," published on March 9, 2002 in no less than the most prestigious Jewish-owned newspaper on the face of the planet: *The New York Times*.

Pointing out that Orthodox Jews "continue to regard the Torah as the divine and immutable word of God," Massing noted that as far back as 1981 the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the official arm of Reform Judaism, published its official commentary on the Old Testament which, Massing wrote, "took note of the growing body of archaeological and textual evidence that called the accuracy of the biblical account into question," and stated flatly that the "tales" of Genesis were a mix of "myth, legend, distant memory and search for origins, bound together by the strands of a central theological concept."

Massing noted, however, that the Reform commentary continued to insist that the Old Testament book of Exodus belonged in "the realm of history." Yet, he noted, while the commentary still recognized that there were those who did insist that Exodus also constituted "folk tales," that was said to be "a minority view."

In fact, Massing pointed out, even *that* changed and the so-called "minority view" came to be the "majority view" even among the Reform rabbis. But more notably—and this was the theme of Massing's article—that majority view was now emerging as the view of even among the rabbis of the United Synagogue of Conservatism Judaism which represents the Conservative Jews in the United States.

So the "conservative" among the Jews had "come around" and they, too, were rejecting the historical foundation of the Old Testament. Massing noted that the Conservative rabbis had just recently issued their own commentary which "to the editors who worked on the book . . . represents one of the boldest efforts ever to introduce into the religious mainstream a view of the Bible as a human rather than divine document. . . ." That is, the rabbis said the Bible was not the word of God.

Massing quoted Rabbi Harold Kushner—one of the editors of the commentary—who referred to the concept that many Conservative Jews had been "locked in a childish version of the Bible." The commentary by Kushner and his fellow rabbis put forth these propositions:

Abraham, the Jewish patriarch, probably never existed. Nor did Moses. The entire Exodus story as recounted in the Bible probably never occurred. The same is true of the tumbling of the walls of Jericho.

And David, far from being the fearless king who built Jerusalem into a mighty capital, was more likely a provincial leader whose reputation was later magnified to provide a rallying point for a fledgling nation.

Among other things: "it seems unlikely that the story of Genesis originated in Palestine. More likely . . . it arose in Mesopotamia, the influence of which is most apparent in the story of the Flood, which probably grew out of the periodic overflowing of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. The story of Noah . . . was probably borrowed from the Mesopotamian epic Gilgamesh."

Another point made by another rabbi: "There is no reference in Egyptian sources to Israel's sojourn in that country and the evidence that does exist is negligible and indirect."

But there's more: According to Massing's assessment of the commentary by the rabbis: "Similarly ambiguous . . . is the evidence of the conquest and settlement of Canaan, the ancient name for the area including Israel." The fact is that excavations showing Jericho was unwallled and uninhabited, one rabbi said, clearly seem to contradict "the violent and complete conquest portrayed in the Book of Joshua."

And as far as the Bible's descriptions of the Jerusalem of David and Solomon, there is an "almost total absence of archaeological evidence" backing up those grand accounts of a great Jewish civilization.

David Wolpe, a rabbi at Sinai Temple in Los Angeles and a contributor to the commentary, told Massing that while these new assertions—representing the Conservative point of view—disturbed many of his congregation, he had still received many messages of support: "I can't tell you how many rabbis called me, e-mailed me and wrote me, saying, 'God bless you for saying what we all believe,'" Rabbi Wolpe said.

And what is even more telling is that Wolpe said that there has been a "reluctance of rabbis to say what they really believe," and that is—and this will surprise many Christians—that these Conservative rabbis really don't believe the Bible is true, that the Bible is the word of God.

So while Christians are taught to believe that the Old Testament is the word of God and that God says the Jews are His Chosen People, even now the "conservative" Jewish rabbis have joined the modern "reform" Jewish rabbis in saying, "Well, the Bible isn't really the word of God."

But Christians are expected to continue to keep up the charade and support the state of Israel and the Jewish people—right or wrong—even though the religious statesmen of so many of the Jewish people are now saying that the foundation for those principles has no historical truth upon which to stand, that the Old Testament is essentially just a man-made document (and, it might be added, a political one at that)!

This is only an overview of the very real emergence of writings within the Jewish world (and elsewhere)—based on archeological and historical facts now coming to the fore—that raise very real questions as to who the Jews really are and what they really believe to be the truth about their history and origins. And all of this taken together points toward the fact that so much of what we have long been told to believe about the Jews—generally by the Jews themselves—is not true at all. And in consideration of the age-old conflict between the Jews and the so-called "anti-Semites," all of this must be kept in mind.

While much of this, admittedly, is most difficult for many (particularly Old Testament-bound Christians) to digest, it all constitutes yet another perspective on this thing called "anti-Semitism," and, in some ways, explains—particularly in the realm of the murky origins of the Jews that we've discussed—precisely why the Jews feel as they do about themselves and about non-Jews and, in all honesty, vice-versa.

This is "hidden history" in the classic sense—history that must be acknowledged if we are able to come to a final disposition of the matter of anti-Semitism and find a way in which Jews and non-Jews can live together, without one group (the Jews) ruling imperially over all others.

CHAPTER SIX

Judaism as a Political Force: No Religion is Exempt From Scrutiny When the World's Survival is at Stake

On the domed ceiling above the main reading room of the Library of Congress on Capitol Hill in Washington is an 1898 work by Edwin Blashfield, a portion of which is entitled "Human Understandings" and depicts the Jews—"Judea"—as those who contributed the idea of religion to mankind.

Frankly, to learn that my tax dollars—as an American citizen—are used to perpetuate such a blatant religious, historical, philosophical fraud—the suggestion that the Jews contributed the idea of religion to mankind—is an utter insult, not only to me as a taxpayer and as a non-Jew, but an insult to all of humanity, not to mention a slap in the face to historical truth (memorialized in a library, of all places, and not just any library, but the library that houses the archives of a great nation).

Despite this grandiose Jewish claim, all manner of mankind practiced religion of some sort from the beginning of time. But even here the Jews demand and assert "first place." It is not so really different, to be honest, from the oft-heard Jewish claim that "we, the Jews, invented pizza, not the Italians." And I don't say that facetiously.

In this same realm, it is fully appropriate to point out something that is little-known to Americans who are constantly reminded that there is "separation of church and state" in their country and that no one religion should be favored in any way by the actions of government. And that is this: it is a documented fact that Jewish organizations run by Jews for Jews are on the receiving end of billions of U.S. taxpayer money, local, state and federal.

This remarkable fact only first came to my attention when I was reading the September 26, 1995 edition of the Palm Beach, Florida *Jewish Journal*. An eye-opening front-page story entitled "Study shows Jewish agencies highly dependent on federal government"—written by Matthew Dorf of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency—read in part:

Reeling from a study showing heavier than expected dependence on government funding, Jewish federations across the country are gearing up for a fight to save their nursing homes, social service agencies and hospitals.

Planned congressional budget cuts to social welfare programs would eviscerate Jewish services nationwide and threaten the entire federation system.

Jewish communal agencies receive more than \$3.67 billion from federal, state and local governments, representing about 41 percent of their total budgets, according to a CJP survey of 45 federations

The words speak for themselves. And I can tell you that in the fifteen years since I first read those words, I have repeatedly seen similar articles (relating to public funding for Jewish agencies) appearing in a variety of Jewish community newspapers, among them the New York-based *Forward* and *The Washington Jewish Week*. So this was not some one-time phenomenon, something out of the past.

Although the Jews scream out of the need for "separation of church and state," they have clearly set up an extraordinary nation-wide taxpayer-subsidized private politico-socio-economic super-structure that underwrites (to an obviously considerable degree) the Jewish community in America. Thus, the combine of "synagogue and state" is evidently quite acceptable. Special privileges—it seems—for God's Chosen People.

Those who think the placement (at private expense by a Jewish religious group) of a Jewish Menorah—the symbol of the state of Israel—on federal land in Washington during Christmas time is a an improper use of taxpayer property to promote one particular religion—even as Christian religious symbols and artifacts on public grounds are prohibited—are quite right in expressing their concern. But how many of those folks know of the billions of their tax dollars that bankroll the Jewish community through the direct subsidies described above?

The linguistic trickery used by the Jewish community and those public officials who do their bidding in handing over taxpayer money to prop up the Jewish community (and consequently its power) to explain these taxpayer subsidies is that these Jewish agencies that rake in these billions of dollars are actually "cultural"—not religious—organizations.

What mendacity!

Today the Jews cry out that anyone who criticizes their religion is somehow taking away their right to practice that faith. But nothing could be further from the truth. And what makes Jewish shrieking about the threat to their freedom so extraordinary is that, of course, it is the Jews who are front and center in the ongoing onslaught by the global (Jewish-controlled) mass media against Islam and the Muslim peoples.

However, the Jews have, in some ways, done mankind a service by thus bringing religion into the realm of widespread political discussion. They have opened up the door and it is a door that is not going to easily be shut. The Jews cannot have a one-way street on the matter. What's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

And in truth, for generations the Jews have been hammering away at Christianity—particularly Roman Catholicism—seeking to "reform" it from within, and forcing (or otherwise attempting to force) Christian churches to change their doctrine to satisfy Jewish demands. So the ongoing assault on Islam is something we can assure our Muslim brethren is something that, unfortunately, is nothing new at all.

What is "new"—and the word "new" does not emphasize the matter enough—is that the Jews are using the public discussion of Islam as the means whereby which to inflame the Christian world against Islam, a veritable clash of civilizations that is being used to advance the New World Order in a way that it has perhaps never been done before. The Jews are using the discussion of religion—in this case, Islam—as the means whereby which they can stoke up a global war.

If the Jews want Islam to be dissected on a regular daily basis, then the Jews, too, should be prepared to face their own religion to be subjected to similar scrutiny, particularly inasmuch as the Jewish political agenda—especially the demand that Israel be considered an exclusively Jewish homeland that deserves special privilege by virtue of its very Jewishness—is founded so clearly on the Jewish religion.

The very underlying political nature of Judaism—and Judaism has always been overtly political throughout history—demands that Judaism be subject to inquiry and criticism. Judaism, as a religion, is thus not off limits. And no matter how offensive much of Jewish religious teachings are to non-Jews (and rightly so) this has nothing to do with the freedom of Jews to practice their religion, as some Jewish agitators might suggest.

Although the beloved author of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, was—as the Jews often loudly proclaim with much insistence—a firm advocate for religious liberty in America for Jews and all people, *what has been carefully censored from the history books is the absolute fact that Jefferson clearly considered the Jewish religion to be quite abominable.*

Writing to John Adams on Oct. 13, 1813, the widely-read intellectual commented on the Talmud and other Jewish teachings:

What a wretched depravity of sentiment and manners must have prevailed before such corrupt maxims could have obtained credit! It is impossible to collect from these writings a consistent series of moral doctrine.

Describing himself as "a real Christian, that is to say, a disciple of the doctrines of Jesus," Jefferson wrote to William Short (on Oct. 31, 1819) that he considered Jesus "the greatest of all the reformers of the depraved religion of his own country."

In a subsequent letter to Short (Aug. 4, 1820) Jefferson added that while Christ preached "philanthropy and universal charity and benevolence," the Jews followed teachings that instilled in them "the most anti-social spirit towards other nations."

Jefferson wrote that Jesus—as a "reformer of the superstitions of a nation," was in an "ever dangerous" position by opposing "the priests of the superstition"—the Pharisees—whom he described as "a blood thirsty race . . . cruel and remorseless as the Being whom they represented as the family God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, and the local God of Israel."

So this is what one of America's most discerning Founding Fathers determined to be the nature of the Jewish religion—that one whose adherents in the modern day have risen to such heights of wealth and power as perhaps not even the well-informed Thomas Jefferson might have imagined.

If Jews are intent upon using their wealth and power to advance their own religious agenda—which they clearly are—then there should be no holds barred (under any circumstances by anyone) in freely discussing the Jewish religious agenda as it relates to world affairs.

And at this juncture, considering my own reputation as an "anti-Semite," it is probably appropriate to address my own religious point of view to the extent it affects my outlook toward matters Jewish.

Although I generally describe myself as a Christian, I have never been particularly "religious" in the classic sense and I have never had any consistent religious training.

My father was of mixed German and Irish Catholic background and was raised as a Roman Catholic (in which religion my older brother was baptized, although I was not).

My mother was of mixed German, Dutch and American Indian heritage and while she had no special devotion to any particular Christian denomination, she did attend church irregularly. When I was a child she had me baptized in the United Church of Christ. Thereafter I periodically attended Sunday school in a branch of the Methodist Church.

So while my religious point of view has never been "fixed," I have nonetheless always had a special admiration for the *traditional* Roman Catholic Church, although I have never formally joined that institution.

I have studied, to a minor degree, the teachings of a number of religions of all types—including, of course, Judaism—and, if truth be told—I have found positive aspects in all of them, including even Judaism.

And as far as Islam is concerned, I will say it for the record: I reject all of the lies and misinformation (and specifically, the DIS-information) about Islam that has run rampant across the globe, particularly following

the 9-11 terrorist attacks. And I will say for the record that I believe that Christianity and Islam have so much more in common than Christianity and Judaism.

As far as my specific religious attitude toward the Jews and their place in Christian doctrine, I suppose it can best be expressed by reflecting on one historic figure in the realm of Christian theology whose teachings are probably as close to my point of view in this realm as any other:

There was once a great German Orientalist, Friedrich Delitzsch, who lived from 1850 to 1922. He was among the founders of modern Assyriology and in the early 1900s he delivered a series of lectures on the links between Babylon and the Bible. He rejected the authenticity of the Old Testament and denied the Jewish origins of Christianity and published a book entitled *The Great Deception*, formally dismissing the Jewish claim of "chosenness."

Delitzsch wrote: "This election is grotesque already in Old Testament grounds since in hundreds of passages that book shows that the Hebrew people did not even want to have Jehovah for a god or be loyal to him. Who can believe that God could have chosen one people and conferred idolatry—a transgression punished in Israel with death—on all the rest of mankind?"

He felt that the Old Testament was "unfit to be used as a normative scripture by the Christian church" and that to argue Christianity was a product of Judaism was a deception and that the idea that "Jehovah has anything to do with our Christian God, is an unheard of fraud perpetrated on all humanity."

He said: "Jesus was no Jew, but a Galilean, whose family was compelled to accept circumcision in Jewish law." He said that Jesus demonstrated "broad universalism and humanitarian outlook [which] are in sharpest possible contrast to the exclusive particularism of the Jews."

Christianity, Delitzsch wrote, was "an absolutely independent, new religion—no mere higher stage in the development of Judaism . . . [And therefore] the study of the Old Testament as a theological subject should be abolished . . . and the New Testament must be freed from its embrace by the Old Testament. . . . [The] teachings of Jesus must be worked out in their purity."

And that, to the extent that I have any religious attitudes toward Judaism and its teachings—and the Christian approach thereto—is what I believe. Not carved in stone, by any means, but there you have it—whether you (or the Jews) agree with my opinions or not.

As far as Jewish religious attitudes are concerned—particularly from a political standpoint—the fact is that there is a little-known but deep-rooted history of virulent Jewish antagonism and violence against non-

Jews (Christians in particular) but many scholars have ignored the record in this regard. It is a topic that is not one that many have ever really explored and the facts about this distressing matter need to be understood, particularly by Christians who are sensitive to candid discussion of matters relating to the Jewish people and their agenda.

However, to his credit, a forthright Jewish academic, Elliot Horowitz, associate professor of Jewish History at Israel's Bar-Ilan University, has come forth with a book that explores the ugly little-known phenomenon of Jewish religious hostility to Christians. The book is entitled *Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence* and was published in 2006 by no less than the Princeton University Press which is not generally perceived to be "an anti-Jewish propaganda outlet."

This heavily-detailed, copiously-documented volume is a stunning contribution to the history of the Jewish people and their troubled relationship with "The Other"—the "Goyim."

Purim—referred to in the book's title—is the Jewish holiday spawned by the Old Testament's Book of Esther, a holiday based on a tale that most Jewish and Christian theologians say is apocryphal.

Esther of legend was the Jewish maiden who—upon being married to the Persian king, who had no idea his bride was Jewish—saved the Jews from destruction at the hands of the king's advisor, Haman, who was then executed, along with 75,000 other Persians. This, of course, was mass slaughter—genocide—and this early anti-Gentile Holocaust is proudly commemorated at Purim. Today again, the Jewish people and Israel target the Persian people—the modern republic of Iran—for destruction.

Most non-Jews have no idea that the Jewish people—who often condemn various historical pogroms (real and imagined) against Jews—actually celebrate this anti-Gentile genocide as one of their most boisterous holidays. Horowitz explains that, frequently, when Jews have broached the story of Purim to non-Jews that they have carefully deleted the conclusion of the story wherein the Jews orchestrated the slaughter of the Persians.

According to Horowitz, Jews have a record of comparing their arch-enemy Haman to Jesus Christ, hardly grounds for promoting "interfaith discourse," or the concept of "Judeo-Christianity," two trumpet calls which (when coming from Jewish sources) mean Christians must amend their teachings to accord with what Jews want Christians to believe. Horowitz notes that comparisons of Haman to Christ are still prevalent in Jewish religious rites today.

In fact, he points out, deeply religious Jews have a record in modern-day Israel of acts of violence against non-Jews, but also acts of vandalism against Christian crosses. Horowitz focuses on how historians and theologians have deliberately distorted these uncomfortable truths about Jewish

teachings and the real impact such teachings have had: that is, the instigation of violence by Jews against Christians.

And note, too, that the comparison of Christ to Haman is very political by its very nature. In fact, later in these pages, (in Chapter Eight) we will explore the story of how an eminent Jewish rabbi went so far as to compare American political figure John Connally (for whom I worked) to Amalek, another perceived enemy of the Jewish people.

An entire chapter in Horowitz's book demonstrates the disturbing, one might say "weird," Jewish hatred for the cross and of Jewish violence against displays of this Christian symbol and notes that, in fact, throughout history this Jewish hatred of Christ and the cross resulted in the rise of anti-Jewish attitudes in response.

Horowitz explores Purim celebrations worldwide and demonstrates that violence and hatred toward non-Jews is commonplace and integral to the nature of that holiday's theme. This ugliness is not the exception. Rather, it's the rule, an unsettling fact to comprehend.

In fact, prior to the 20th century, at which time Jewish influence upon Christian religious discussion rose to great heights, most Christian theologians shared the view of German Protestant theologian Carl Heinrich Cornill who said of the Book of Esther that "all the worst and most unpleasing features of Judaism are here displayed without disguise." Cornill echoed Emil Friedrich Kautzsch, who said the Book of Esther "expresses such national arrogance and such hatred of other nations."

In a similar vein, British Baptist Dr. Thomas Davies said of the Book of Esther that, in its teachings, "Nothing seems wrong if only it furthers the advancement of the Jews."

And that, you see, is precisely why many people have a problem with Jewish religious teachings, particularly as they are applied to the often dangerous world of international relations, a world where the Jewish state of Israel controls one of the biggest arsenals of nuclear weapons of mass destruction, where religiously-grounded Jewish political fanaticism in Israel is rising to heights not seen before.

And further in-depth scrutiny of Judaism adds fuel to the fires of concern. The record shows, conclusively, that Jewish hostility to Jesus Christ, Christians and the Christian religion is solidly grounded in Jewish religious teachings.

For years, Jewish groups screamed when anyone dared to openly discuss the vile nature of much of what appears in the Talmud, which is the Jewish religious code (Judaism's governing body of religious and ethical standards) about which most non-Jews have no understanding.

And while the Jews often go to great lengths to assure the Christian world that anyone who is citing the Talmud—the founding document of

rabbinic Judaism in late antiquity—as evidence of Jewish hatred for Christianity is somehow distorting the truth, the facts demonstrate, very much indeed, that this hatred is at the core of Judaism itself.

Should anyone doubt this, they need only refer to a 2007 book, *Jesus in the Talmud*, published by the same Princeton University Press that issued the aforementioned work, *Reckless Rites*. The promotional material for the book itself candidly asserts in no uncertain terms:

Scattered throughout the Talmud, the founding document of rabbinic Judaism in late antiquity, can be found quite a few references to Jesus—and they're not flattering.

The Talmudic stories make fun of Jesus' birth from a virgin, fervently contest his claim to be the Messiah and Son of God, and maintain that he was rightfully executed as a blasphemer and idolater.

They subvert the Christian idea of Jesus' resurrection and insist he got the punishment he deserved in hell—and that a similar fate awaits his followers.

The author of the book that documents these eye-opening assertions is a distinguished scholar, Dr. Peter Schafer, Director of the Program in Judaic Studies at Princeton University and professor of Judaic studies in a chair endowed by billionaire American Jewish philanthropist Ronald O. Perelman, a longtime generous patron of Jewish causes.

Highly regarded in the academic world and widely published in the arenas of Jewish religious and historical literature, Schafer has now come forward with this must-read 210-page book which affirms—beyond question—that longtime Christian and Muslim critics of the Talmud were right when they said that the Talmud does teach filthy and hateful things about Christ, Christianity and Christians.

Christians (and Muslims, too, by the way) have been offended for thousands of years by those hateful teachings about Jesus Christ and—indeed, let it be said—these teachings have been one of the primary causes of anti-Jewish attitudes throughout history, the direct consequence of negative reaction to the Talmud's anti-Christ rantings.

Yet, although Judaism's holiest book has devoted itself to smearing Christ, his beloved mother, Mary, and all of Christ's teachings, the mass media never mentions this when discussing the causes of anti-Semitism.

In fact—quite distinctly—the media prefers to focus on alleged anti-Jewish notations in the Christian New Testament and in the Islamic Koran (which, sadly unbeknownst to many Christians, holds Jesus Christ in high regard, very much in contrast to the Talmud).

Many Christians mistakenly believe the myth that the Old Testament is as central to Judaism as it is to the origins of Christianity, when, in fact, nothing could be further from the truth. The Talmud and other mystical works (unknown to Christians) are considered far more important in the eyes of Jewish scholars.

Now with Schafer's book, there's "mainstream" proof that defenders of the Talmud have been dissembling—to put it bluntly, lying. This fascinating (and disturbing) book is a "must" for those who delve into the controversial arena of Zionism and who want to be armed with factual evidence regarding the weird world of the Talmud. But be warned: if you are a committed Christian or a Muslim you will most assuredly be offended by the disgusting comments about Christ that appear in Judaism's holiest writings.

In a similar context, it should be pointed out that although many American Christians view Israel as "The Holy Land" they have absolutely no idea what a wicked society exists there today.

Many Christians will be shocked to read the revelations that follows in the exact text of an article published on Nov. 16, 2009 in *Ha'aretz*, one of Israel's most respected newspapers. The article appeared under the candid headline: "U.S. State Department: Israel is not a tolerant society."

It is interesting to note even though many U.S. newspapers did mention the State Department report referenced in this article (which focused on religious freedom in nations around the globe) the American media suppressed the negative references to Israel mentioned in the State Department report the Israeli newspaper article described. American media reports instead focused on State Department criticisms of other countries, but did not mention Israel's failings.

The Israeli newspaper account of the State Department report—far more accurate and revealing than the misdirection appearing in the American media—reads thus:

Israel dismally fails the requirements of a tolerant pluralistic society, according to a new report from the U.S. State Department.

Despite boasting religious freedom and protection of all holy sites, Israel falls short in tolerance toward minorities, equal treatment of ethnic groups, openness toward various streams within society, and respect for holy and other sites.

The comprehensive report, written by the State Department's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, says Israel discriminates against groups including Muslims, Jehova's Witnesses, Reform Jews, Christians, women and Bedouin.

The report says that the 1967 law on the protection of holy places refers to all religious groups in the country, including in Jerusalem, but "the government implements regulations only for Jewish sites. Non-Jewish holy sites do not enjoy legal protection under it because the government does not recognize them as official holy sites."

At the end of 2008, for example, all of the 137 officially recognized holy sites were Jewish. Moreover, Israel issued regulations for the identification, preservation and guarding of Jewish sites only. Many Christian and Muslim sites are said to be neglected, inaccessible or at risk of exploitation by real estate entrepreneurs and local authorities.

The report makes it clear that practices that have become routine in Israel are considered unacceptable in enlightened countries and should be corrected.

Among other examples, the report notes that more than 300,000 immigrants who are not considered Jewish under rabbinical law are not allowed to marry and divorce in Israel or be buried in Jewish cemeteries.

Further underscoring the frightening nature of what is happening in Israel—the Jewish state—came reports of the publication in 2009 of a book entitled *The King's Torah*, written by Rabbi Yitzhak Shapira, a leading Jewish spiritual authority and head of an Orthodox Jewish school in one of the so-called "hardline" settlements of the Occupied West Bank.

The Israeli newspaper *Maariv* candidly described the rabbi's work as "a guide to whoever is deliberating if and when it is necessary and permissible to take the life of someone who is not Jewish."

The book—which was endorsed by prominent and respected Jewish religious figures in Israel—suggested that any non-Jew (including children and babies) who could, in any way, pose a threat to Israel's existence should be killed.

A summary of one portion of the book makes it clear that any non-Jew (a "gentile" as described in the Israeli press reports) who, in any way, no matter how innocently, is perceived to be a threat to Israel should be slaughtered: "In any place that the presence of a gentile endangers the existence of Israel, it is allowed to kill him . . . also if he is completely not to blame for the situation that has been created."

Why kill infants?

The Jewish religious authorities explain that: "There is a reasonable explanation for killing infants if it is clear that they will grow up to hurt us—and in this situation, the strike should be directed at them."

In addition, innocent people are allowed to be killed if they belong to a state that Israel considers an enemy. In other words, if Israel (or Jewish authorities) decided that America was, in some way, a threat to Israel, innocent Americans could be sent to the slaughter.

These are facts. There are not quotations from the pages of an "anti-Semitic conspiracy theory book." Respected Jewish rabbis in Israel, supported by Jewish people in Israel, are heralding these ideas as ways to defend Israel.

Although lunatic figures such as John Hagee, Pat Robertson, Tim LaHaye and the late Jerry Falwell would probably find some twisted logic to endorse this homicidal madness, there are few sane Americans (of any religion) who would. That is why it is so vital that sane Americans learn of the kind of terroristic, murderous teachings hold sway in Israel today—ideas found in the ancient teachings of the Jewish Talmud.

Nothing new—but bad just the same.

Is "little Israel"—the reputed "apple of God's eye"—a danger to non-Jews? Are Jewish supporters of Israel of a religious and philosophical nature that would lead them to take violent action against those perceived to be "anti-Semites"?

The answer is "yes"—without qualification.

Note the words, for example, of a well-known American Jewish academic, Dr. David Perlmutter, writing in *The Los Angeles Times* on April 7, 2002, reflecting on Israel's nuclear might and how it could be used to vanquish the world in the face of growing "anti-Semitism." In his essay, entitled "Dark Thoughts and Quiet Desperation," Perlmutter issued a threat of no uncertain terms to the world:

What [is Israel] to do?

I have other dreams as well—apocalyptic ones. I think: Israel has been building nuclear weapons for thirty years.

The Jews understand what passive and powerless acceptance of doom has meant for them in the past and they have ensured against it.

Masada was not an example to follow—it hurt the Romans not a whit, but Samson in Gaza? With an H-bomb?

What would serve the Jew-hating world better in repayment for thousands of years of massacres but a Nuclear Winter? Or invite all those tut-tutting European statesmen and peace activists to join us in the ovens?

For the first time in history, a people facing extermination while the world either cackles or looks away . . . have the power to destroy the world. The ultimate justice?

Now there will be those who will dismiss Perlmutter as some sort of person to be ignored. They do so at their own idiocy and peril.

You see, when Perlmutter wrote these words he was associate professor of mass communication at Louisiana State University (where he taught for ten years) and a senior fellow at the Reilly Center for Media & Public Affairs. A graduate of the prestigious University of Pennsylvania, where he received both his bachelor's and master's degrees, and of the University of Minnesota where he was awarded his doctorate, Perlmutter is the now director of the University of Iowa School of Journalism and Mass Communication. What's more, he is a regular columnist for the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, perhaps the leading in-house voice of the American academic community.

In short, this is a creature who has—through his entire career—been an influence upon probably thousands of young minds, would-be journalists who were being taught by this unvarnished fanatic driven to his political madness and advocacy of violence by his Jewish religious views.

May we ask the logical question: How many Jewish terrorists did this Jewish professor spawn? Will one of Perlmutter's proteges somehow, some way, in the future, be part of a plot against America or any other country that may be deemed hostile to Jewish interests?

But note carefully that Perlmutter is not the only distinguished voice in the Jewish community levelling threats against mankind.

A Dutch-Jewish academic, Dr. Martin van Crevald of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, has long been accorded the honor of being hailed as Israel's preeminent geopolitical and military thinker. His own threat against the non-Jewish world appeared in an interview in January 2003 with the Dutch magazine *Elsevier*. Of Israel's military capacity, he said:

We possess several hundred atomic warheads and rockets and can launch them at targets in all directions, perhaps even at Rome. Most European capitals are targets of our air force. Our armed forces are not the 30th strongest in the world, but rather the second or third. We have the capacity to take the world down with us. And I can assure you that this will happen before Israel goes under.

Taken in context—particularly these vile threats—is it really beyond the pale—even “anti-Semitic”—for the non-Jewish world to be concerned about Jewish religious teachings and attitudes toward non-Jews, particularly as they apply to geopolitical thinking? Is it any wonder that the great Voltaire said of the Jews: “They are, all of them, born with raging fanaticism in their hearts . . . I would not be in the least bit surprised if these people would not some day become deadly to the human race.”

Is it wrong to point out that Israeli defense policy is founded on the “Samson Option”—that Israel would commit national suicide and take the world down with it, using its nuclear arsenal as the means, if it ever perceived its days numbered? Should non-Jews not be concerned that Jews (in Israel and elsewhere) might potentially be very dangerous religiously-driven enemies capable of mass murder and mayhem on a global scale?

After all, no less than Rabbi Dov Fischer, vice president of the Zionist Organization of America, asserted in *Forward* on April, 19, 2002 in no uncertain terms that, “We are a people of history . . . Our history provides the strength to know that we can be right and the whole world wrong.” Quite an audacious claim, to say the very least, particularly in the context of a potential Jewish nuclear confrontation with the rest of the world!

Naturally, all things considered, we can understand why Jews would not want us to subject their religious teachings to scrutiny. However, any non-Jew who says that inspection of Jewish ideology is off-limits must be considered, at the least, a naive fool, and, at worst, a willing tool of the New World Order forces that seek to limit discussion of topics related to the never-ending cacophony of matters relating to Jewish political, media, financial—and military—power in our dangerous world of today.

While the New World Order directs our attention to “the Muslim threat” and stokes up fears of Islamic Sharia Law taking hold in America, it is my opinion—shared, I’m sure, by quite a few million knowledgeable people on this planet—that the real threat lies elsewhere.

We thus cannot help but recall the rantings of “Christian” evangelist Pat Robertson who said, “Islam is a violent—I was going to say religion—but it’s not a religion. It’s a political system. It’s a violent political system bent on the overthrow of governments of the world and world domination.” Well, Robertson’s rhetoric was on point, *but not about Islam*. Instead, what Robertson attributed to Islam is, in fact, quite directly reflects the mindset of the Jewish elite (and their followers) in our world today. The world domination they seek is the Jewish Utopia. It is the New World Order. And that is why it is proper for non-Jews to subject Judaism’s teachings to the scrutiny it clearly deserves.

The much-admired (if flawed) literary icon, F. Scott Fitzgerald, once penned this succinct commentary: “A Jewish holiday, a Gentile tragedy,” which suggests that Fitzgerald understood Judaism all too well.

And then there is the assessment by the ingenious novelist and historian H. G. Wells—who, unlike Fitzgerald, cannot be dismissed by the Jews as an embittered drunk—who once mused that “there is room for some very serious research into the question why anti-Semitism emerges in every country the Jews reside in.”

Think about it.



This circa 1900 illustration from the popular *Judge* magazine is entitled "The New Jerusalem—formerly New York" and portrays the growing perception at the time that Jewish people were literally invading the city in the waves of late 19th Century and early 20th Century immigration by Jews, overwhelmingly from Eastern Europe, and virtually establishing a stranglehold on business, finance and social affairs in that teeming metropolis. Below is a 1880s-era American caricature of Jewish plutocrats, representing the growing perception of the rising Jewish influence in the world of finance and industry that spiraled upward in the century that followed.



CHAPTER SEVEN

Jewish Misuse of Wealth and Power: A Political Issue That Must Be Addressed

The Jewish domination of the mass print and broadcast media in America and the misuse of that considerable power must be brought to an end. It would be useless here to expend any energy outlining the reality of Jewish control of the media. Anyone who denies the fact of Jewish media control (and influence otherwise) is either a liar or a fool or both.

For those with a further interest in the topic, I refer them to my earlier work, *The New Babylon*, which explores Jewish domination of the media, citing facts and names and figures, in stark detail.

I have seen, first hand, in a very intimate and disturbing way, how the propaganda of the Jewish-controlled media has impacted upon the thinking of even so many people who otherwise know better.

In the spring of 2003—during the big propaganda build-up by the Jewish-controlled media in favor of U.S. intervention in Iraq—I was invited to lecture at the Zayed Center for Coordination and Follow-Up in Abu Dhabi, the capital of the United Arab Emirates. This was the think tank of the Arab League—funded by the royal family of Abu Dhabi—so this was, needless to say, quite an auspicious honor for a little old country boy such as myself. I know my late father would have been very impressed and would have told everybody and his brother.

I recall being very eager to tell my mother and phoned her to do so. She listened as I told her excitedly of my forthcoming venture to the farthest reaches of the Arab world. And then there was a dead silence at the end of the phone.

"Mother?" I asked. "Isn't that something?"

There was another dead silence.

"Mother!" I said more demanding. "Well?"

There was another dead silence.

And then she said quietly, "I don't want you to go."

"Now why not, for God's sake?" I responded.

She said, "Well, I would worry about you."

I said, "Oh my God, Abu Dhabi is one of the safest places in the world. They have no crime whatsoever."

And she said in a halting voice, "But those people over there—"

"What in the world do you mean by 'those people over there'?" I demanded, in an increasingly frustrated tone.

"Those people—" she said—"They ... they ... hate us ..."

My own mother—who I knew did know better—had actually said that: "They hate us." I couldn't believe what I was hearing.

"Oh my god, Mother!" I roared into the phone. "You of *all* people. Where have you heard *that*?"

"Well," she sighed. "I've seen them on television. They hate America. They have all those big protests, shouting and waving signs."

"Oh my God," I said again. "Mother, that's all propaganda from the Jews. You know that. Don't tell me that *even you* have been taken in by all of this nonsense." And then I said, "Well, you said it, you *saw it on television*. You've heard it in the media. *Who* controls the media?" I asked.

"Yes, I know what you mean," she conceded. "I guess you know a lot more about it than I do, but I understand what you're saying."

I told her: "Well, the very fact that even you have been taken in by all of this bull—even though you know probably 99% more about these matters than 99% of the American people—just goes to show you how pervasive these lies are. Imagine what the average little old ladies think about all of this."

And then she said, "Well, I guess the main reason I'm worried is because I'm your mother, and that's what mothers are supposed to do."

That was a cute—and touching—conclusion to the matter, but the reality of what that conversation represents is all too clear: the point that even sensible people (like my late mother) could be swayed by the gyrations and contortions and distortions and mystical legerdemain by the Jewish controlled media.

And that's just another reason why I want to see these masters of the media and their warmongering allies brought to heel and made to face justice. They inflicted mental anguish on my mother through their relentless propaganda and they've done likewise (even more so) to so many other American mothers, particularly those who've sacrificed sons and daughters in the wars being fought for Israel's survival and domination of the Middle East.

That's a very personal story, of course, but I've always believed anecdotes such as this are a powerful representation of political realities that are otherwise only expressed through harsh rhetoric.

The story having been told, let it be noted that we are not here to say that unprecedented Jewish wealth is necessarily the issue. No, in the end, what is at issue is how the Jewish community exercises its power (particularly its media influence) that has emerged as a consequence of its wealth, especially in the arena of corrupting U.S. foreign policy.

The truth is that two of the great tragedies of our new century—the 9-11 terrorist outrage resulting in the deaths of 3,000 Americans and the unnecessary and disastrous American invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan that resulted in countless lives being lost and ten times that many being maimed—are both a direct consequence of U.S. Middle East policy.

This is, of course, a policy that has been dictated by the "Jewish lobby" in Washington and actively encouraged by the American media monopoly that is largely owned by a handful of families and financial interests who are Jewish supporters of Israel.

In his book, *Transforming America's Israel Lobby: The Limits of Its Power and the Potential for Change* (Potomac Books, 2009) Jewish writer Dan Flesher argues that "the fact that a small core of American Jewish neo-conservatives . . . directly contributed to the disastrous war [in Iraq] should not be blamed on the organized American Jewish community as a whole."

However, Flesher adds pointedly: "But the fact that few American Jewish leaders or groups disassociated themselves with these people points to a major need for a communal soul-searching."

And this is precisely the problem: the American Jewish community has effectively aligned itself with the predominant "war hawk" mentality among its wealthiest and most powerful leaders. And, as such, those who fail to speak out are also part of the problem, even more so now that the Jewish lobby is pushing for war against Iran—and any other nation perceived as a threat, in some way, to "little Israel."

How many more wars and related tragedies will occur because American Jews have accumulated so much power and have used it to bend American policy in such a parochial fashion, forcing America's elected and appointed officials to carry out policies that, more often than not, are contrary to America's interests?

How many more innocent people have to die? How much longer will an influential special interest group continue to dominate U.S. foreign policy?

These very serious questions standing alone demonstrate why a candid discussion of the wealth and power captured by the Jewish elite in America is fully within the realm of thoroughly acceptable and logical public debate, despite what the well-funded and often hysterical demonizers at the ADL, for example, might say to the contrary.

However, to be sure, it is not only in foreign policy that Jewish influence makes its presence felt.

The influence of Jewish organizations in shaping modern-day (and most disastrous) U.S. immigration policy was paramount.

Likewise with Jewish influence in issues such as separation of church and state and the institution of "thought control" measures that infringe on First Amendment freedoms. The range of issues is endless and could constitute a library of work in and of itself.

However, of course, those who raise questions about Jewish influence are hit with the always damaging charge of "anti-Semitism."

One person with a little "inside" knowledge about Jewish power in America was the much-heralded "Man from Independence," the late Harry Truman. Although Truman is hailed as the American president who recognized the new-born State of Israel in 1948, the Jewish world reeled in horror on July 11, 2003 when *The Washington Post* published excerpts from Truman's unpublished private diary in which Truman reflected quite candidly on Jewish attitudes and Jewish power. One entry on July 21, 1947 was particularly harsh and read as follows:

The Jews have no sense of proportion, nor do they have any judgment on world affairs.

The Jews, I find, are very, very selfish. They care not how many Estonians, Latvians, Finns, Poles, Yugoslavs or Greeks get murdered or mistreated as [postwar] Displaced Persons as long as the Jews get special treatment.

Yet when they have power—physical, financial or political—neither Hitler nor Stalin has anything on them for cruelty or mistreatment to the underdog.

Remember: these were not the ravings of Adolf Hitler nor of some anti-Semitic right-wing street agitator. These words were not penned by a "Jew-baiting conspiracy theorist" or by a "Muslim terrorist." They were not the mutterings of a bitter misanthrope. They were the private musings of a beloved American president, the down-to-earth "Give 'Em Hell Harry." Was he wrong?

In fact, there is very significant support from even Jewish sources that have suggested there is a considerable Jewish political power in America. The former speaker of the Israeli kneset, Avraham Burg, for many years one of the towering figures in Israel, has laid this matter out in no uncertain terms. In his 2008 book, *The Holocaust is Over—We Must Rise From Its Ashes*, Burg wrote with candor:

Jewish American leaders tend to justify their government's wars and support the most right-wing foreign policies, especially vis-a-vis Israel and the Middle East. They are against everybody, including Germany, Russia, and the Arab countries.

Furthermore, the official, organized Jewish voice is a power to reckon with in every election campaign. It is very difficult to be elected to high office in America against the wishes of the Jewish lobby.

Financial and organizational resources, public support, legitimacy—and not least, the damage the Jewish lobby can cause to

unwanted candidates—turn Jewish involvement in American politics into a factor with strategic international consequences.

In the unlikely event that anyone missed his quite provocative point, the former speaker of the Israeli kneset added further:

Jews hold stunningly powerful positions and clout in the United States. The combination of the American state's power and the Jewish power in the areas of legislation, administration, media, law, business, culture, and entertainment have made the Jews a defining factor of contemporary America. Because Israel is inseparable from the identity of American Jews, Israel is inseparable from the American experience.

Mark Ellis—a university professor of Jewish studies and the founding director of the Center for Jewish Studies at Baylor University—is a leading authority on contemporary Judaism who has been described as one of the most influential Jewish thinkers of his generation. And he has, quite notably, emerged as a major critic of the Jewish lobby and of the state of Israel. In his book *Judaism Does Not Equal Israel* (published in 2009 by the New Press in New York), Ellis acknowledged the very real power exercised by the Jewish community:

Though our power can be and sometimes is exaggerated, to deny it is ridiculous. Israel is the dominant military power in the Middle East, joined at the hip to the only super-power in the world, the United States.

In the United States, Jewish influence is everywhere. Often used for good, it is also used to stifle dissent and orient intellectual and political life toward Jewish interests as defined by the Jewish establishment.

Whether the Jewish establishment actually advances Jewish interests in the long run is highly debatable.

Regardless, Jewish power is in every nook and around every corner in America.

Any Jewish dissident knows this on a visceral and experiential level. Non-Jews who speak on behalf of Palestinians know this as well.

Ellis has also noted that the charge of "anti-Semitism" to quash criticism of Israel has become rampant. The distinction, he says, between real Jew hatred and political gamesmanship is becoming increasingly blurred.

And Ellis notes in no uncertain terms that if the Jews want to have a front-and-center role in political affairs that they had better get used to political give-and-take. He is essentially telling his fellow Jews that, to borrow an old saying, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen," when he asserts directly:

Maturity is the ability to separate anti-Semitism and political differences . . . If Jews have indeed reentered history as a power to be reckoned with, there will be those who need and want to reckon with that power. Politics is a power game. Jews are not exempt. Those who benefit from Jewish power will welcome it, and those who are injured by that power will oppose it.

Another forthright Jewish critic of Israel and of the intrigues of the Jewish lobby in America is the cantankerous Norman Finkelstein who—in his 2005 book, *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History*, published by the University of California Press—laid it all out on the table:

Jewish elites in the United States have enjoyed enormous prosperity. From this combination of economic and political power has sprung, unsurprisingly, a mindset of Jewish superiority. Wrapping themselves in the mantle of The Holocaust [Finkelstein's capitalization of those words], these Jewish elites pretend—and in their own solipsistic universe, perhaps even imagine themselves—to be victims, dismissing any and all criticisms as manifestations of 'anti-Semitism.'

And, from this lethal brew of formidable power, chauvinistic arrogance, feigned (or imagined) victimhood, and Holocaust-immunity to criticism has sprung a terrifying recklessness and ruthlessness on the part of American Jewish elites.

Alongside Israel they are the main fomenters of anti-Semitism in the world today. Coddling them is not the answer. They need to be stopped.

So it is that despite the fact the Jews have such immense power in the American political arena, the Jews still continue to proclaim themselves to the American people as "victims" and drum up "The Holocaust" and cast themselves as a sorrowfully pitiful "oppressed minority" still facing suspicion and discrimination.

And what is so particularly amazing is that so many Americans still believe this audacious tissue of lies!

One Jewish writer—Pulitzer Prize-winning David M. Shribman of *The Boston Globe*—has quietly and candidly captured the reality of the overwhelming Jewish role in American life. And as he makes clear, the Jews are hardly "victims." Quite the contrary.

In a revealing essay—"Hosts, Not Visitors: The Future of Jews in American Politics," (appearing in *The Jews in American Politics*, edited by L. Sandy Maisel and published by Roman & Littlefield)—Shribman says that "the Jews are comfortable in the American home, not as visitors but as hosts." Shribman says that the Jews are firm advocates of policies that ensure the continuing rule in America by the power elite:

The greatest indicator of the place of Jews among the host population of this country is their place in the political life of the country, not only as agents of change (which is a traditional role of newcomers seeking to shape a nation to their inclinations and interests) but also, unavoidably and significantly, as agents of the status quo.

It is in the latter role, prominent primarily in the more recent past, that American Jews sealed their place in the host community of the nation. . .

Not until American Jews felt so vested in the way things already were did they begin to assert themselves as conservatives and thus as bulwarks against radical change.

In that role, especially, they established themselves as important elements of the host community and, in political terms, of the host's coalition.

So Jews most assuredly do have a prominent place at the table—and some would say they sit at the head of the table. They are hardly surviving on scraps passed down by some "WASP Power Elite."

In any case, Shribman's assessment of the power of the Jews in America today—as key figures helping impose and maintain "politics as usual" upon the American people—recalls the words of Jewish historian Albert S. Lindemann writing in *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews* and reflecting upon historical speculation regarding the activities of wealthy and influential Jews on events in the past:

Trends that put new kinds of power in the hands of political and economic elites inevitably increase the appeal and plausibility of long-standing charges, trumpeted by the popular press, that "money men" were working behind the scenes.

It was widely believed, for example, that wealthy Jews were

responsible for the Boer War (1899-1902). The Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) was similarly believed to have been orchestrated by internationally-powerful Jews to humiliate Russia, whereas the ensuing revolution in Russia in 1905 was considered to be the work of an unlikely alliance of Jewish capitalists, socialist agitators, and populist demagogues.

The sensational anti-Semitic affairs of the period were based on beliefs in Jewish conspiracies of various sorts. . . . The belief that powerful Jews were manipulating important events often excited the general public of Europe and America.

However—and this is important—note that Lindemann also added this further: He acknowledged that “contrary to facile assertion, clandestine Jewish involvement, or actions by Jewish power brokers, did exist in these various events,” but carefully noted, though, that the Jewish intrigues in question were “often part of Jewish self-defense, of ‘fighting back’” and suggested that they were “hardly in the far-reaching ways believed by the anti-Semites of the day.”

So even while Lindemann seems to be playing the middle ground, he has actually admitted that there *were* high-level intrigues traceable to powerful Jewish elements of precisely the sort being alleged at the time—manipulating events, orchestrating wars and revolutions—and that those intrigues *were* traceable directly to Jewish self interest, in this case, according to Lindemann, that of “self-defense.”

In that context, then, we can say frankly—and quite in line with what Lindemann said—that World War II was also a matter of Jewish “self-defense,” and that it was, as the British nationalist Arnold Leese described it, a “Jewish War of Survival.” And the same can be said of the war in Iraq where thousands of non-Jewish Americans have died and been butchered in furtherance of the Jewish Agenda: saving “little Israel.”

In short, “Jewish self-defense” (the term used by Lindemann) is just that: *Jewish* self-defense. And Jewish self-defense is not *American* self-defense. It isn’t now, it never has been, and it never will be.

And that’s why inordinate Jewish power in America is so dangerous. Americans have no reason to fight wars orchestrated *by* the Jews *for* the Jews but that *is* what *has* been happening since the beginning of the 20th Century and unless things change that is precisely what will be happening throughout the 21st Century.

Although the Jews have played the “patriotism” and “homeland security” card—trumping up fears of Islam and Sharia Law and the possibility of “another 9-11”—the wars America has been fighting (and may fight) in the Middle East have nothing to do with *America’s* self-defense.

And this aspect of “Jewish self-defense”—the misconduct of American foreign policy to benefit the interests of Israel and the international Jewish Agenda (ultimately the New World Order)—is critical. And we will explore it more broadly and directly in a moment.

But for the meantime, it’s worth pointing out that this issue of “Jewish self-defense” has been around for a mighty long time.

In 1936 Random House published *Jews in America* which was the text of an extended article that had originally been published in *Fortune* magazine. Exploring the myths and realities about Jewish power in America and the nature of anti-Semitism, the essay concluded:

It still remains true that the future of the Jew in America is puzzling. Can this universal struggle be absorbed in the country, which has absorbed every other European stock? Does he wish to be absorbed? Can he live happily in peace if he is not absorbed? The answers must be guesses. Upper class Spanish and German Jews have been pretty well absorbed.

There are, however, numerous Jews who look upon the loss of Jewish identity as a kind of social suicide. If those groups, Jewish and non-Jewish, who wish the identity and distinction of the Jews preserved are able to carry their point, then the only hope for the Jews in America is a mutual toleration and respect.

Since, however, toleration and mutual respect are also the only hope of all who wish to preserve or reestablish democratic institutions in this country, the Jews in America will have numerous allies.

The first condition of their success will be the quieting of Jewish apprehensiveness and *the consequent elimination of the aggressive and occasionally provocative Jewish defensive measures which has the country has recently and anxiously observed.* [Emphasis added].

So although the *Fortune* essay found that Jews were not as powerful as a lot of people perceived, *Fortune* was still compelled to point out that “Jewish apprehensiveness” had led to “aggressive and occasionally provocative Jewish defense measures.” And the fact that *Fortune* would even dare to raise this point—right at the time when anti-Nazi and anti-Hitler frenzy was growing in the Jewish community and in the Jewish-controlled media in America—is an interesting point indeed.

You see, those aggressive and occasionally provocative Jewish defensive measures have truly been a major cause of anti-Semitism, and *Fortune* was wise (and candid) enough to make that point.

Now let it be said that there was, in American history, another revealing element of "Jewish self-defense" that few people know about and of which many of my readers will be surprised to learn.

Although, today, it is generally reckoned that "the Jews opposed McCarthyism"—and indeed many Jewish sources are the loudest to condemn what is known as "McCarthyism"—a deep, dark secret of that period surrounding "McCarthyism" is that key "Jewish self-defense" groups—namely the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai Brith and the American Jewish Committee—were secretly acting behind the scenes and pointing fingers at suspected communists, the very "crime" that has come to be associated with McCarthyism.

In his 1977 book, *Jews Against Prejudice: American Jews and the Fight for Civil Liberties* (Columbia University Press), Jewish writer Stuart Svonkin let the cat out of the bag:

As committed Cold War liberals, staff members of the ADL and AJC cooperated with the FBI, HUAC [the House Un-American Activities Committee], and other agents of the federal loyalty and security program during the late 1940s and 1950s, sharing their files on politically suspect organizations inside and outside the Jewish community.

This policy of cooperation, which built upon the partnership established during the antifascist campaign of the 1930s and early 1940s, was designed to minimize the association of Jews with communism, to protect liberals from persecution, and to ensure that the federal government remained attentive to the activities of right-wing extremists.

While the AJC and ADL hoped to moderate HUAC's methods, these attempts to reform the anticommunist crusade from within reflected a basic acquiescence to the assumptions and strategies of the domestic cold war and inevitably contributed to the infringement of civil libertarian principles.

Very revealing. Even shocking to some people. But those are the facts. In my book, *The Judas Goats*, I featured a highly controversial chapter that explored this part of hidden history in detail. Not comfortable reading for many people, but just the facts.

Now having examined this concept of "Jewish self-defense" and how it has impacted in an extraordinarily broad manner on the American political process, to a degree that the term "McCarthyism" has achieved an iconic status all its own, it's important—vitally so—to consider how the "New McCarthyism" is actually being utilized for "Jewish

self-defense" in our modern era. The "New McCarthyism"—as I and others have called it—is the constant repetition and ranting about (you guessed it) "anti-Semitism" that is rife in the media today. *And it has taken on an extraordinary twist to this remarkable point:*

Propagandists for the Jewish Agenda now openly charge that critics of Israel (and of U.S. favoritism for Israel) are not only "anti-Semitic" and "anti-Israel" but *also* "anti-Christian" *and* "anti-American," that anti-Israel sentiments are actually the underlying foundation of anti-Americanism and, in turn, anti-Americanism is inextricably indivisible from anti-Israel, anti-Semitic and even *anti-Christian* sentiments.

Such extraordinary assertions are being nurtured at the highest levels of the Jewish-controlled mass media and are being inserted into the discourse of public debate in America.

The idea that the rest of the planet (with the exception of Israel) is "anti-American" is a dangerous myth propagated in order to turn Americans against anyone around the globe who dares to question Jewish power in America.

Thus, the concept of "anti-Americanism" is a Jewish invention. In the wake of the 9-11 terrorist attacks and in the period leading up to the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, the Jewish-controlled media began hyping "anti-Americanism," to stoke up the so-called "war on terrorism" of which, it was said, the campaign to destroy Iraq was a vital component.

The media began advising Americans that "The whole world is against us"—or, as it was generally rendered in the media: "The whole world is against us good Americans and our good friend Israel."

The theme that "anti-Americanism" had run rampant was instilled in Americans for the purpose of making them "anti" everyone who refused to support the wars the Jewish lobby demanded that Americans fight. In a sense, support for the Iraq war (in particular) became the measuring stick by which to determine who was in sync with the more broad-ranging global Jewish Agenda and who wasn't.

In any case, as noted, so-called "anti-Americanism" was now being equated with opposition not only to Israel and Jewish interests but even to Christianity itself—an extraordinary theme indeed.

This concept was outlined in the January 2005 issue of *Commentary*, the journal of the American Jewish Committee, in an essay by a Jewish writer—Yale Professor David Gelernter—entitled "Americanism—and Its Enemies" who stated it flatly: "In modern times, anti-Americanism is closely associated with anti-Christianism *and* anti-Semitism." [Gelernter's emphasis] Later, Gelernter expanded upon his initial rantings in *Commentary* in a full-length book (published in 2007) pretentiously titled, *Americanism: The Fourth Great Western Religion*.

There Gelernter expressed the contention that the United States (base of what he called "American Zionism") is now charged with an imperial (even God-given) duty to remake the world, that "Americanism" is "the Creed," of this global agenda, that this "Fourth Great Western Religion" is the driving force behind—and which must establish—a new planet-wide regime: in short, the New World Order. He wrote:

We are the one and only biggest boy [in the world today]. If there is to be justice in the world, America must create it. . . . We must pursue justice, help the suffering, and overthrow tyrants. We must spread the Creed.

All of this reflects the mindset of those who are now dictating American policy in the name of a grand scheme of advancing their global agenda. And that's why Americans need to fight Jewish power in America: it is the driving force behind the New World Order.

It is no wonder that Jewish writer Adam Garfinkle—in his aforementioned book *Jewcentricity: Why the Jews Are Praised, Blamed, and Used to Explain Just About Everything*—said quite directly: "The United States of America is probably the most Jewcentric society in world history, in a largely philo-Semitic way."

And while Garfinkle contends that non-Jews exaggerate the influence of the Jews, he also suggests that "American Jews . . . help them do it," which is Garfinkle's gentle, if satirical but still candid, way of saying that Jews actually *want* non-Jews to think that the Jews are even more powerful than Jews really are.

And that, if true—and I believe it is—suggests that the Jews themselves are actually playing on so-called "anti-Semitic stereotypes" about Jewish power to effectively increase their power. And what that says about the Jews—and their effort to manipulate the American public mindset—I will allow the reader to decide.

Even those who have rushed forth to fight anti-Semitism—such as the late William F. Buckley, Jr., often called "The Grand Poo-Bah of the Kosher Conservatives"—have sometimes been forced to admit that Jewish power in America is indeed something to be reckoned with.

In his 1992 book, *In Search of Anti-Semitism* (published as a so-called "New York Times Notable Book" by Continuum) Buckley recalled describing to his colleague Joseph Sobran his feeling that Sobran was giving readers the idea that he (Sobran) was "obsessed" on the subject of Israel and told him that, in the political arena, that is a "moral disease."

Buckley reminded Sobran that liberal Republican former Pennsylvania Governor William Scranton had, for a generation, been one of the two or three most influential Republicans in the country. However,

when Richard Nixon sent Scranton to the Middle East as a special envoy and Scranton returned to say the United States should adopt a "more even-handed" policy that Scranton "has never been heard from since."

And that anecdote—while seemingly humorous in tone—does say much about the reality of Jewish power as a force in the American political arena today.

So even an esteemed "liberal" Republican such as William Scranton could be cast to the winds. His sole "crime" was having dared to suggest that perhaps the United States needed to rethink its pro-Israel policy. And as we all know too well, there have been more than a handful of previously well-hailed American politicians who have suffered the same fate as so clearly described by former Rep. Paul Findley (R-Ill.) in his monumental (and chilling) work, *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby*.

And while today there are many Americans who think that "the liberals and the Blacks and the Jews" were the primary base of support for Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota in his ill-fated bid for the presidency in 1972—a campaign in which McGovern was perceived as an all-out liberal, even a "radical"—there's much more to the story.

In his 1974 book, *Jews in American Politics*—described (probably correctly) as the first mainstream work to investigate what the publishers called "the amazing role Jews play in American politics"—longtime *Washington Post* correspondent Stephen Isaacs explored the little-known point that, in fact, "the Jews" were not quite so enamored with McGovern and for reasons which are revealing indeed.

A so-called "New York intellectual"—and yes, that means a *Jewish* intellectual—is quoted by Isaacs as having said of McGovern that the senator "reminded the Jews of America's only home-grown anti-Semites: the Populists."

When McGovern went about inveighing against "the interests" according to Isaacs, "somehow it sounded to Jews as if he were talking about them. Their concern about McGovern," wrote Isaacs, "was the simple notion that Jews have figured in the life of big city Goyim, they haven't figured in the life of small-town South Dakota, and so [McGovern] had no personal stake in Jews. In short, they saw McGovern as a dumb Goy—a mid-Western preacher—and he gave them bad vibes."

Even Hyman Bookbinder—Washington representative of the American Jewish Committee—warned that McGovern's support for quotas for Blacks in hiring and education was something upsetting to Jewish interests—again, a revelation to those who have missed the point that, contrary to the popular image, the Jews have not been quite the "allies" of the Blacks in the civil rights cause as many have so wrongly believed.

McGovern also roiled the Jews by suggesting that a path to Middle East peace would be through what he favored: a negotiated peace under the auspices of the United Nations. As one writer noted:

For that . . . McGovern fumbled away Jewish money and Jewish votes; he did not seem to know that Jews considered the U.N. to be as great an enemy of Israel as the Arabs. It did not take long for word to race through the Jewish community that McGovern would not be good for Israel.

In fact, the Jewish reaction to George McGovern is hardly any different from the way that many Jews—during the American Revolution—chose to ally with the British crown. As Morris U. Schappes wrote in *A Documentary History of the Jews in the United States* (published by Schocken Books in 1976):

The loyalists were generally found among the rich merchants and landowners who put the class benefits they expected to derive from the continued connection with Britain above the national interests of the new state.

While motivations involved factors such as abstract concepts of loyalty and personal and cultural ties with English life, the decisive factors lay deeper in the class relations, *including especially fear of the democratic masses*. [Emphasis added.]

So even going back to the American Revolution there was an inherent fear by the Jews of popular forces at work.

And it was in the midst of the McGovern campaign that we began to see the Jews (historically perceived to be "on the left") begin—at least in the ranks of their intellectual leadership—an amazing transmogrification into the so-called "neo-conservatives" whom we see at work on American shores today, leading the "shock troops" of the New World Order elite.

In essence, the old-time Trotskyite Communists stepped off the public stage long enough to change their costumes and return to the glare of the footlights in time to proclaim themselves the leaders of the "new conservatism" that was emerging in America.

In his book *The Neo-Conservative Revolution: Jewish Intellectuals and the Shaping of Public Policy* (referenced earlier) Murray Friedman described how the Jewish neo-conservatives—led by Norman Podhoretz and the American Jewish Committee's *Commentary*—launched what Friedman described as "what became one of *Commentary's* most enduring campaigns: an all-out assault against racial preferences."

And this, of course, came at the same time the neo-conservatives—as I documented in detail in my book *The High Priests of War*—were forcefully pushing the traditional conservative movement further and further into alliance with Israel and in favor of U.S. internationalism, working energetically to eviscerate the remaining vestiges of old-style American nationalism in Republican Party ranks which then still stood as a force in opposition to the New World Order and the Jewish Agenda.

And what Friedman noted further is quite revealing indeed when one considers the conflicts of the 1970s that were erupting between the "liberals" and the "conservatives" in American life.

"In some respects," wrote Friedman, "the coming struggle between liberals and conservatives was a struggle within the Jewish community." In other words, it was effectively "the Jews" who were deciding the parameters of public debate.

In fact, Friedman noted, "the neo-cons shared one characteristic of the New Left: Jewish leadership."

In addition, Friedman noted, "the leading publications on both sides of the divide were edited by Jews as well."

According to Friedman, "the neo-conservative impulse was a spontaneous response of a group of liberal intellectuals, mainly Jewish, who sought to shape a perspective of their own while standing apart from more traditional forms of conservatism. [Jewish ex-Trotskyite neo-conservative Irving] Kristol called neo-conservatism a 'new synthesis.'"

(Kristol, as many readers will know, is the father of William Kristol, editor of Zionist billionaire Rupert Murdoch's warmongering *Weekly Standard* and one of the leading neo-conservative voices today.)

Friedman said that Kristol sought "to reshape . . . [an older-style liberalism]—so as to attach to it the *conservative* [Kristol's italics] predispositions of the people to rid it of its 'paternalistic orientation.'"

So, for all intents and purposes, what we had in America was a proverbial "Jewish family fight" and—as Friedman pointed out—"a central element" in the "evolving views" [of the neo-conservatives] was the question, "Is it Good for the Jews?"

And that provocative question happened to be the title of a pivotal and influential February 1972 article in the American Jewish Committee's *Commentary* written by Norman Podhoretz, one of the foremost neo-conservative proteges of the aforementioned Irving Kristol.

"Is It Good for the Jews?"—you see—is the *operative* question for the Jewish community in America, and as we noted earlier, Jewish interests are not necessarily American interests and vice-versa, although from the rhetoric we see coming from the Jewish community today, it might be hard to divine that simple and very real geopolitical reality.

And while it is certainly the right of the Jews to look out for their own interests, non-Jews have that right as well. But the problem is that the non-Jews simply don't have the power and influence of the Jews.

And that gets right to heart of the problem of overwhelming and inordinate Jewish political power in America—an influence stemming, of course, from the substantial wealth held in the hands of the Jewish community and of the extraordinary Jewish influence over the media.

Considering all of this, it is no surprise to find (as we'll see in a moment) that even leaders of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith—which portrays itself as a leader of the liberal vanguard, working on behalf of the interests of the down-trodden—are actually very much working to ensure the continuing interests of the power elite;

In short, these Jewish elements are, as noted earlier, in the words of Jewish writer David Shribman: "agents of the status quo . . . bulwarks against radical change . . . important elements of the host community and, in political terms, of the host's coalition."

Evidence of the ADL's elitist—some might say "royalist"—point of view can be found in no uncertain terms in the 1982 book, *The Real Anti-Semitism in America*, written by Nathan Perlmutter, then national director of the ADL and the former national associate director of the American Jewish Committee. Perlmutter said frankly that many Jews in America were concerned about proposed matters of "reform" that had the potential of being a "carrier of fall-out, corrosive to Jewish interests."

What constituted the type of proposed reform that so worried this influential Jew and the forces which he represented? One proposed reform being debated in American political circles was the concept of changing or abolishing the Electoral College. According to Perlmutter:

While attempts to scuttle the Electoral College have been led by persons in no way anti-Semitic, if they are successful they will debase Jewish political currency—something anti-Semites have failed to accomplish.

Why would abolition of the Electoral College interfere with "Jewish political currency" as Perlmutter gently describes what he really means is "Jewish political power"? Writing in his book, *The Jewish Phenomenon*—a glowing celebration of Jewish wealth and power published in 2000 by the Longstreet Press—Steven Silbiger explains the little-known fact that Jews actually magnify their voting power:

About 80 percent of eligible Jews in the United States are registered to vote, compared to about 50 percent of all voting-age adults. In addition, registered Jews are twice as likely to

vote. Combining the two multiplies Jewish voting power by a factor of three. Furthermore, 81 percent of Jews live in only nine states, making them a significant political bloc, especially on the national level. In presidential elections, those nine states cast 202 of the 535 votes in the Electoral College. Thus, the Jewish population could provide the swing vote in any close presidential election.

In New York, for example, which has a Jewish population of 9%, they effectively constitute 18.3% of the electorate. In New Jersey, Florida, Massachusetts, Maryland, Connecticut, California, Pennsylvania and Illinois, the Jewish percentages are likewise essentially doubled, meaning that Jews have far greater electoral power than their numbers and are thus vested in keeping the Electoral College intact.

So now we can understand why—although the Jews historically waged open, no-holds-barred war against the U.S. Constitution—there is one provision of the Constitution they *would* like to see preserved.

And while Perlmutter of the ADL acknowledges that Jews in America have long had disagreements with traditional Christians on matters such as school prayer, pornography and abortion, he still says that the issue of Israel's security (and the Christian support for Israel) stands paramount:

[When] these issues on which we differ, singly or together, are weighed against our agreement on the prerequisite for the physical security of Israel, they simply do not balance the scale. Jews can live with restricted abortions. Indeed societies have through the centuries. [The Equal Rights Amendment] is an important issue, but Jews can live without ERA.

The security of the state of Israel is far more an issue, in terms of that nation's life and death and in terms of the lives and deaths of its population than the issues on which many fundamentalists and many Jews differ.

And it should probably be noted, just for the record, that although Perlmutter suggests that "Jews can live without ERA," the truth is that—again, contrary to the public image—it was actually powerful Jewish leaders in Congress who had historically opposed the ERA: namely, liberal Republican Sen. Jacob Javits and his liberal Democratic House colleague from New York, Rep. Emanuel Celler.

While these two liberal Jews were doing all they could to stop the ERA's progress in Congress, it was—and this will surprise you—Sen. James O. Eastland, a Mississippi Democrat known as a "segregationist," who was the primary Senate advocate of the ERA from the beginning.

In light of this, perhaps, we can understand why the Jewish-controlled media gave such immense publicity to “conservative” Phyllis Schlafly who led the public fight against the ERA, even giving her a regular commentary on CBS radio at the height of the controversy. In short, for reasons of their own, the Jews opposed the ERA, but they used a “right wing Christian”—Mrs. Schlafly—to do their public dirty work.

Now this assertion—based on facts—will disturb many of those Americans who cheered on Mrs. Schlafly, but they are, as we said, facts and they are the type of strange details found in our “hidden history” that present a new light on Jewish intrigues and political devilry in America.

Although Mrs. Schlafly and other ERA opponents often hailed “good conservative Jews” who opposed the ERA, the truth is that some of the biggest, loudest, most liberal Jews—powerful figures in Congress known as key advocates for the Jewish Agenda—were among ERA’s foremost opponents. And, by the way, in case you had forgotten, the Equal Rights Amendment was never approved. It had *nothing* to do with Phyllis Schlafly’s opposition and *everything* to do with that of the Jews.

And considering what we have seen of the ADL’s Perlmutter saying about the preeminence of placing Israel’s interests first—and of how “social” issues could be set aside—we can now clearly see why—beginning in the 1970s—the Jewish-controlled media conjured up “Christian” leaders such as Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell and others of their ilk.

Although the so-called Christian “leaders” were taking stands contrary to Jewish views on social issues, these same “leaders” were fully in line with the Jewish Agenda on the international stage. And for the Jewish forces behind the New World Order—that is precisely what they needed.

The Jewish media gave full voice to these Judas Goats who were leading the Christian sheep to the Zionist abattoir and the average grassroots American fundamentalist played right along with the charade.

And it is not an exaggeration to say that the use of these Judas Goats and the manipulation of their followers has been part of the “Jewish self-defense” policy that Jewish elites have been utilizing in their broad-ranging drive to bring their New World Order into being.

Jewish self-defense may be “good for the Jews” but—thus far—it hasn’t been “good for the Goyim” (to use a Jewish turn of phrase) and, from a specifically American standpoint, it hasn’t been good for America.

The Jewish misuse of their considerable wealth and power in the United States and across the globe is at the heart of the problem the world faces today. Even granting that the Jews have lawfully assembled their vast wealth—a point that can be debated—there is no question that they have used that wealth to amass immense political power that has not been utilized for the public good. And that, as I said, is the problem.

CHAPTER EIGHT

How I Discovered the Problem of Anti-Semitism . . .

Over the decades—some thirty years now—that I’ve been writing and speaking out on controversial issues, people both here in the United States and around the world have asked me how I came to be so closely associated with the topic of “anti-Semitism” and the issue of what has historically been described—by Jews and non-Jews alike, and in both popular and in intellectual circles—as alternately “the Jewish Problem” or “the Jewish Question.” It seems appropriate to use this forum to answer that question for those who are interested.

First of all, let me say this—and I am not kidding you: My views on these topics have nothing to do with my early toilet training. Don’t be offended or shocked. I am quite serious. Let me explain before I go any further and before you close this book in disgust . . .

On October 7, 2006 the *New York Times* published the obituary of Dr. Mortimer Ostow, a New York-based psychiatrist and neuroscientist described as a “theorist on anti-Semitism” who—the *Times* said—“studied the psychological sources of anti-Semitism and other expressions of religious and racial fanaticism,” outlining his discoveries in his 1996 book *Myth and Madness: The Psychodynamics of Anti-Semitism*.

Now brace yourself. Here is precisely what the *Times* reported regarding this distinguished psychiatrist’s claims about anti-Semitism:

In the 1980’s, [Ostow] led a group of psychologists and psychoanalysts in a study that investigated the root causes of anti-Semitism. In reviewing case histories of patients, the group found that negative feelings and a resentment of Jews could sometimes be traced to early childhood.

Dr. Ostow and his colleagues suggested that such feelings might be linked to troubles in toilet training or even an Oedipal rivalry, in which a son’s negative impressions of his controlling father could be projected onto Jews.

What madness!

What sick, twisted thinking.

And let me say frankly: this is precisely the kind of filth found in the pages of the Jewish holy teachings known as the Talmud: scatological, often pornographic, sexually-oriented garbage not so really different from what one might find coming from a foul-mouthed Jewish comic at a resort in the Catskills.

And bear in mind that these "scientific" conclusions were the work of a psychiatrist who, according to the *Times*, maintained "a long association with Jewish Theological Seminary in Manhattan, where he instructed rabbinical students in aspects of psychology in an effort to help rabbis better understand family dynamics and problems."

So my suggestion that there might be some sort of Jewish religious and philosophical foundation for Ostow's allegations regarding the origins of "anti-Semitism" is probably not far off the mark—no matter how much my Jewish critics will howl in protest.

For the record: although both of my parents were gone by the time that Ostow went to his reward (and I therefore had no opportunity to quiz them as to the circumstances of my toilet training) I am here to tell you that my memories of those days are not particularly profound.

But I do recall now, as this is written, that many years ago I had read of Ostow's work in this realm (in a volume on anti-Semitism I discovered in my college library) and brought his bizarre assertions to my mother's attention—with an appropriate humor that she appreciated—and with a laugh and a smile she assured me that I was quite responsive to her instructions and that I had no problems in toilet training whatsoever.

Likewise I must say that I had no perception of my father being "controlling"—he was quite an entertaining character, in fact—and I am fairly certain I did not consider him an Oedipal rival for my mother's attentions, although I'm sure Dr. Ostow might say I was "in denial"—sort of like when I've been called a "Holocaust denier."

I write these words with all serious measure, precisely because of the fact that this kind of vulgar thinking permeates the writing and rhetoric of not just the likes of Ostow but all of those individuals and institutions who make "fighting anti-Semitism" their (profitable) business.

With that out of the way—although it had to be mentioned (much as I hesitated doing so)—I'd like to take you on a serious exploration of how I came to where I am today.

Having always been interested in history and politics since I was (a precocious early reader) about five years old—I was born, by the way, in 1960—my earliest interest came in the realm of American history. Having discovered a guide to the American presidents in my grandmother's home, I soon knew all of the presidents and their histories. And then I began developing a interest in the bloody American Civil War, an interest probably stimulated by the fact that my mother was a big fan of the Civil War-focused film *Gone With the Wind* and had read the book to me as a child, even before I saw the film for the first time when it was re-released in 1967 to our mutual delight.

Of course, I played Civil War—and I had a quite expensive set of

Civil War soldiers on a really neat playing board complete with a big Southern mansion—and I played "Army" and Cowboys & Indians and Cops & Robbers and dabbled with toy trucks and mini cars (known as Matchboxes) and built many small towns with Lincoln Logs and the modernistic "Super City" through which my extensive toy railroad tracks and trains rolled merrily.

In fact, I combined my interest in history and public affairs with these childhood games. I had a plastic model of the White House that I set up next to the Matchbox City (which was also part of my fantastic collection of all manner of toys and games). The White House was my home, outside which I parked my toy Rolls Royce and my toy Mercedes (I guess I had some grandiose ideas in those innocent days!)

At one point I was "mayor" of Matchbox City and I even got impeached. So although I was more politically aware than most kids (even the older ones), I was your average American boy and had lots of friends from different backgrounds.

In short, matters related to the issues of either Semitism or anti-Semitism did not concern me. They were not subjects of interest or concern at all—then.

What little I knew about the Jews that I learned at home came from my father. A proud Marine veteran of Pacific combat during World War II, he enjoyed reading about World War II and on more than one occasion he displayed to me the famous picture of the "Little Jewish Ghetto Boy" commenting, "Look at how those dirty goddamned Nazis treated the Jews. Look at this poor little Jewish boy."

The photo, which is ubiquitous, appeared in one particular book that he read a number of times over the years, so I got treated to that sorry image on multiple occasions.

Years later, of course, I learned that the famous Jewish boy had not died at the hands of the Nazis; rather, in fact, two different Jewish gentlemen—one living in New York and one living in London—both claimed that they were the iconic figure in the iconic picture.

In any case, I was not raised to hate Jews, but to pity them and, essentially, to admire them. My father told me, on more than one occasion, of a nice Jewish boy he knew as a child and how very intelligent the Jews were.

I should note point out, however, that—through my influence—my father's knowledge of these matters broadened considerably and, as years passed, his open-ness to new ideas and otherwise hard-to-find facts led him to a major reversal in his outlook.

In fact, in my very least conversation with my father, literally just a hour or two before he died in the hospital in 1990—suffering the rav-

ages of cancer treatment (emphasis on the word "treatment")—he and I talked about some new developments in the realm of Holocaust history: the point that the Polish government had now determined that, four million people (Jews or otherwise) had not died at the Auschwitz work camp during World War II. The numbers were considerably less, thereby effectively rewriting the so-called "facts" of history that people worldwide had been taught for some thirty years.

In any case, I had brought my father around on these issues and, I'm pleased to say, he often borrowed my hard-to-find books and lent them out to his friends who were, in turn, educated to some of the cold, hard facts of history.

My mother was indifferent to God's Chosen People—a point that may astound the Jews since they generally expect people to either love them or hate them. But no, my mother was indifferent.

However, ultimately, my mother likewise came to understand that so much of what she had been told about so many matters relating to God's Chosen People happened to be propaganda and lies. Like my father, my mother read many of the books that had helped me gain my own education and she, too, understood the big picture, so to speak.

Now I should mention, though, that my father's brother—my Uncle Bob—who was a veteran of World War II, was an unabashed anti-Semite in the classic sense. Growing up, I recall Bob talking candidly about Jewish power, but at this particular time in my life, as I've noted, these issues were not part of my intellectual playing field. Nor, in fact, was I regularly exposed to Bob's point of view; on the average, I saw him (only briefly at that) perhaps every several years.

Many years later, though, I came to understand what Bob was talking about and I subsequently had many animated conversations with this very likeable guy. (His wife, Helen, was a favorite of mine as well.)

At any rate, as far as the state of Israel was concerned, any knowledge I had came from the news coverage of the wars Israel was fighting in those days and I wasn't really paying any attention. I hardly even paid attention to Vietnam although my beloved eldest brother had been drafted and spent time there in combat (more about that later).

There were no Jews living in the rural community in central Pennsylvania where I grew up, although I often saw Orthodox rabbis who came from New York to butcher the chickens at the Empire Kosher Poultry plant that dominated the economy of the local region. The rabbis and the out-of-town Jewish plutocrats who ran Empire were held in high regard and many local folk were proud to be as one with them.

In the nearby small city where I had been born and where my grandmother lived, there were a number of prominent and influential

Jews (businessmen, lawyers, doctors, scrap dealers, etc) about whom I heard on occasion, but—I should add—never in a negative sense. They were all very much publicly revered. God's Chosen People, y'know.

And, in fact, both of my brothers (eleven and fourteen years older than I) had Jewish girlfriends who were the daughters of successful businessmen in that city.

However one of those rich Jewish daddies—who was in the vending machine business—died when his car exploded on a return trip from a business meeting in Pittsburgh. It was only years later I learned he had been the victim of a mob hit orchestrated by some angry business associates—a point not mentioned in the local newspaper which delicately painted his death as a tragic accident, although everybody apparently knew better.

One other prominent Jew that I had some—though little—interaction with was Howard Cohen, the proprietor of two local cinemas that my friends and I patronized.

In fact, I suppose, it was effectively Mr. Cohen who made me aware of something we call "sex." You see, while one of Mr. Cohen's theaters was strictly devoted to mainstream films, his other institution frequently deviated from "family fare" and one could walk by the historic Embassy Theatre in downtown Lewistown—right off the main business street, facing distinguished and historic Market Square—and see—right there on the streets in open display—graphic advertisements for X-rated films Mr. Cohen screened for the sensual pleasure of his patrons.

Years later when I became aware of the prominent role of Jewish folks in pornography, I remembered Mr. Cohen's contributions to culture and marveled when I learned that the local Brotherhood of Christians and Jews had named Mr. Cohen their "Man of the Year."

But the only Jews I could say I actually knew were two middle-aged Jewish spinsters—the Zackowitz twins—a pathetic twosome (one of whom was bent over and crippled, having been run over by a speeding vehicle) who certainly didn't fit the stereotype of the "wealthy and powerful Jew." In fact, the twins subsisted on welfare and lived next door to my grandmother in a public housing apartment building for low-income and elderly folk. I got to know the Zackowitz ladies quite well over the years and they were quite fond of me and I of them.

My grandmother died in 1987 and that was the last I saw of the Zackowitz sisters, but many years later my mother reminded me of something I had forgotten: At one point my grandmother and one of her friends had become involved in a silly conflict with the Zackowitz sisters—a "battle" between little old ladies. The Zackowitz sisters complained to building management and—at one point—it appeared that

my grandmother and her friend might be evicted. The primary reason for concern was that one of the Zackowitz sisters had overheard—through my grandmother's open door—my grandmother and her friend referring to "those Jews next door."

My grandmother had thus stood accused of "anti-Semitism" (!) and there could no less political nor, for that matter, no less religious woman than my grandmother. I had forgotten—if I had ever even known—that little detail, but it certainly means a lot to me now.

One other interesting item: at one occasion in the late 1960s or early 1970s, the Jewish synagogue attended by the Zackowitz sisters was egregiously vandalized. And the local newspaper devoted a full page of graphic pictures displaying the desecration of the holy Jewish relics inside the ravaged temple. I remember the photographs. I remember that there were discussions of "anti-Semitism." But it was not until probably 30 years later that my mother told me something that she had been told by the Zackowitz sisters (and which was something that I had never known until then): it turned out that the desecration of the synagogue was the work of the rabbi's son. This was known in the Jewish community but not by the public at large. The local newspaper did not devote a news story to unveiling that development.

By the time I learned this interesting detail, I had already come to know that—on many, many occasions—such "acts of anti-Semitism" had often been linked not only to just-plain-crazy Jews and Jewish trouble-makers but—even more pointedly so—to Jews with a political agenda, hoping to exploit "anti-Semitism" for their own ends.

Now speaking of political ends, and this is important, I've only thus far talked about my personal interaction with Jews (and I think that's important, considering the context of this book). But I did develop a certain cultural and political awareness of Jews during my early teenage years, perhaps above and beyond the average kid of my age.

Being a voracious reader—and not just of things political—I first discovered that Jews were really different from non-Jews through an interesting and roundabout way.

Always interested in language, linguistics, etymology and onomastics—the study of names—I happened upon H. L. Mencken's classic work, *The American Language*, in the library and found a fascinating exposition by Mencken on the history and development of Jewish family names, a story (obviously) that inter-linked with Jewish history and, of course, the topic of "anti-Semitism." I was intrigued. I realized, coupled with much of what I had read elsewhere—and experienced in my interaction with Jews—that the Jews were—as they themselves often proclaimed, I eventually learned—different. Very much so.

That, in a sense, was my first "political" introduction to the Problem of Anti-Semitism, and however definitive it may have been, it was largely peripheral to my basic political awareness and whatever philosophy I was developing, consciously or unconsciously.

I mentioned my early interest in Civil War history and a fascination with the American presidency. That began developing into a growing interest in U.S. political affairs in general that finally blossomed—maybe exploded—full force during the 1976 presidential campaign which is precisely the time that my interest in all things political fell into place.

However, I was a vociferous supporter of Republican Richard Nixon in 1968 (following an early flirtation with third party candidate George Wallace, whom I suppose I identified with *Gone With the Wind*) and then of Democrat George McGovern in 1972.

I supported McGovern, at age 12, because I had (by that time) realized the horror of war and supported McGovern's anti-war position. I knew nothing then about "liberal" or "conservative." And partisan politics meant nothing. I was just plain anti-war.

I was very much against the war because I was just instinctively anti-war. Ultimately, many years later, I eventually saw the effect that the war had on my older brother who is dead today. He survived the Vietnam War, but he never really recovered from the physical and psychological impact of the war. Sadly, he was one of many victims of war.

And yet, ironically—if I must tell the entire truth, and I will—my brother was a firm supporter of the policies of George W. Bush. Like many good patriotic Americans, my brother—a traditional conservative—was taken in by the Zionist propaganda of Fox News and other "conservative" outlets rampant today.

In any case, being very, very anti-war, I actually began *noticing* U.S. foreign policy. Beginning in the early 1970s—in my early teens—I had pretty much come to the conclusion that the primary powder keg—the foremost problem—for U.S. foreign policy was the Middle East. And that was precisely—I determined—because of all-out U.S. support for Israel.

At that time, I see in retrospect, I had no understanding of the plight of the Christian and Muslim people of Palestine who had been immorally and illegally driven from their homeland. I knew little—if anything—of their suffering. At that time I was conscious, mostly, of the fact that Americans and others were subject to the whims of the angry "Arab hijackers" who were then in the news.

And I recall saying once if I said it a hundred times that if I were on a hijacked plane I would say to those Arab hijackers: "Hey, wait a minute. I don't support these insane pro-Israel policies. Don't make me and others pay a price for the policies of our government."

I recognized that there was a very big Arab world out there—one which controlled a Hell of a lot of oil that the United States needed—and it just didn't make any sense to me that my country would ally with Israel under any circumstances. I had virtually no knowledge—unlike today—of the real teachings of Judaism. Islam and Muslim culture were as distant to me—really unknown to me—as Mars or Pluto.

And, as I noted, the issue of Palestinian statehood (or, rather, the lack thereof) was not, at that point, anywhere part of my calculation. My view of the Middle East was based on plain old solid geopolitical thinking from a classic “America First” point of view. In no way, I concluded, could a pro-Israel policy place America first.

Above all I realized that U.S. policy toward the Arab world was almost certainly setting the stage for a disastrous war in the Middle East (involving the United States fighting on behalf of Israel) in which American soldiers were fated to die.

And at that time—reflecting on stories about “Arab terrorism” that were rife in the media—I told anyone who would listen that—ultimately—the United States would be the victim of a terrorist attack from the Arab world as a consequence of our Middle East policy. Israel, I had concluded, was not good for America.

There were others, though, who had different opinions. I recall one old woman—who had, until then, been one of my favorite librarians—telling me that I shouldn't say bad things about Israel. After all, she said, Israel was the homeland of the Jews—God's Chosen People—and it was our duty to stand by the people of the Bible. And Jesus, she reminded me with all due emphasis—was a Jew. In fact, he was a Jewish rabbi. “Jesus is my rabbi,” proclaimed this nice Christian woman.

It was in response to these kinds of “intellectual” arguments that I began writing Arab embassies in Washington and obtaining material presenting “the other side of the story” that couldn't be found in the mainstream media—or in the standard libraries. And I began the process of writing a variety of American political organizations that I discovered were daring to raise questions about these policies that I found so disastrous and threatening to my nation's survival. Notable among them was Liberty Lobby, the Washington-based populist institution—founded by Willis Carto—that published the national weekly newspaper, *The Spotlight*, of which I became a reader (at age 16) in 1976.

By this point, then, I was coming to understand the nature of what confronted the Palestinian people—a human story that was quite out of the harsh geopolitical realm upon which I had previously focused. I discovered—all too quickly—that this was an untold story of very real horror and sadness. And the Jews, let it be said, were responsible for it.

In any event, to bring matters full circle, it was in 1976 that my hard-core fascination with politics fell into place.

In those days I believed—as many still do today—that politics was just “Democrat vs. Republican” and I believed there was a real difference between “liberals” and “conservatives.” In those days, I counted myself as a conservative first and as a Republican second. (I'm embarrassed to admit that today, but that doesn't mean I'm either a “librul”—as I call liberals—or that I'm a Democrat.)

Ultimately, I came to see that the real difference was between the nationalists and the internationalists, and, in the end, it became clear to me that the primary—virtually unchallenged—power force in American affairs was the role of the Jewish lobby and the global Zionist agenda, the most dangerous and pivotal influence behind the New World Order.

The very first time that I heard an adult (other than my Uncle Bob, mentioned earlier) speak directly to me about the extraordinary power of the Jews was some time in 1977 when I was having a conversation with a highly-regarded local high school teacher (who had also been the founder of the library in my home town). I remember it well.

Acknowledged for her intellect, the colorful and widely-traveled Ruth Cramer Waters surprised me, in the course of one of our numerous private and public political conversations, when she said frankly, “Oh, the Jews have a lot of money and a lot of political power in this country.” And she didn't say it in an approving way.

And Ruth—bear in mind—was a liberal Democrat and an outspoken one at that. So in those days, when I considered myself a conservative Republican, the fact that Ruth and I—who often clashed politically—shared that concern was something that intrigued me to no end.

Now there's an interesting follow-up regarding Ruth that I'll mention later—and it's very interesting indeed. Permit me to keep you, the reader, in suspense, for the time being. It will be worth the wait.

However, I should probably mention, too, that the second time I heard an adult mention Jewish power to me directly was in 1978 when Ruth introduced me to one of her friends who needed a skilled typist which Ruth knew me to be.

In fact, on a humorous note, when I had received my first typewriter for Christmas, someone told Ruth at the time and she growled, “Oh no. Now he'll really be putting out a lot of propaganda!”

Ruth's friend—who happened to be a well-known community leader and a quite accomplished academic—mentioned to me while I was working with her that she had a lot of experience with Jews, having gone to an Ivy League college where, she said, “there were a lot of Jews,” and that although they were very powerful in America, she had

found, in her experience, that "when they give you guff, you give it right back to them." (And, in fact, I came to remember those comments and I can say here and now, so many years later, that she was absolutely right!)

So again, here was a very credible source saying things about Jewish power that I had already come to understand, largely through my own study, but it was not something that was freely discussed in my own limited circles (although, remarkably enough, I did have one friend—quite well read and a former fundamentalist Christian—who, in the course of his own research, had reached the same conclusions as I had).

So having heard the same thing on two different occasions from two remarkable ladies who were heralded for their intellect was impressive to me indeed. I knew I wasn't operating blindly.

I should mention—as a tribute—another friend of mine, the late "Colonel" Dallas Texas Naylor (yes, that was his name) whom I had known since kindergarten. He was like a member of my own family and we remained lifelong friends until his untimely death from cancer in 2004 and he shared my political enthusiasm and concerns about Jewish power. In fact, he had even worked for the Jews at Empire Kosher.

We often crafted letters to the editors of our local newspapers discussing "controversial" subjects, driving our always less literate and less articulate critics crazy, much to his delight and to their distress.

In later years, I got him a job acting as security guard for Liberty Lobby in Washington when I came to work for that populist institution. Dallas was obstinate and energetic—a true "character" of the first order—and you always knew exactly where he stood on any matter. I will always recall his particular (and quite notable) skill in verbal repartee. He had an amazing capacity—in no-holds-barred language—to cut people down to size in an always amusing fashion. That was Dallas.

My political journey escalated when—as a student in college at George Washington University in Washington, DC—I worked for a brief period on the 1980 national campaign staff of former Texas Governor John Connally who was then seeking the GOP presidential nomination.

It was during that time Connally called for a Palestinian state—a bold move he hoped would catapult him to the forefront of the GOP primaries, demonstrating he was a tough leader unafraid to tackle controversial issues. But, in fact, a barrage of heavy-handed attacks on Connally—calling him an "anti-Semite"—drove him from the race.

As the "copy boy" in the national office of the Connally campaign it was my responsibility to photocopy news articles about the campaign and distribute them to top staffers. So from very real hands-on knowledge, I am here to tell you the smears of Connally ran rampant throughout the media, generated—entirely—by the Jewish community.

But what is interesting is that Connally's speech was considered so inflammatory by the Israelis and their American supporters that an American rabbi, Emmanuel Rackman, actually called publicly—in writing, no less—for Connally's assassination.

Here is the story: Comparing Connally to Haman, the ancient enemy of the Jewish people, Rackman issued his call for Connally's assassination in the November 18, 1979 issue of *The Jewish Week-American Examiner*, the publication of the Israeli-government owned Jewish Telegraph Agency, a subdivision of the worldwide Jewish Agency.

Rackman's vicious attack on Connally was headlined: "John Connally Campaign Seen as Dire Threat to Israel and U.S. Jewry." Rackman quoted *New York Times* columnist William Safire—a hardline pro-Israel Jew—who said of the speech that "for the first time, a candidate for President has delivered a major address which he knew would disturb and dismay every American supporter of Israel." Of Safire's remarks, Rackman commented:

This is true. But does not this observation signify more than it says? Does it not mean that in Connally we have, for the first time, a candidate who in no uncertain terms is telling the American people that he does not want the support of Jews and that he wants to prove that one can be elected president without Jewish support.

Furthermore, does it not mean that at long last we have a candidate who hopes to get elected by mobilizing support from all who share his total disregard of how Jews feel about him and is this not an invitation to all anti-Semites to rally behind him? I am generally not an alarmist but nothing in American politics in recent years so disturbed me as Connally's subtle communication to Jews that they can 'go to the devil.' Even the Nixon tapes were not so upsetting.

The American Jewish community must be alerted. If only we had stopped Hitler early enough, millions of Jews would still be alive. And Connally must be stopped at all costs. He must not even get near the nomination! He must be destroyed, *at least politically*, as soon as possible. It is sufficiently early to make Connally look ridiculous and destroy him politically *without bloodshed*. [Emphasis added.]

And note carefully Rackman's words. In no uncertain terms the rabbi was suggesting that, in the end, Connally—if not destroyed "at least politically" would have to be destroyed with bloodshed.

Perhaps I am overreacting," added Rackman. "But if I have learned anything especially from the rabbinic view of Biblical history it is that we are less fearful and more forgiving of enemies who at least accord us a modicum of respect than we are of enemies who treat us with disdain, with contempt. That makes [Palestinian leader Yassir] Arafat more acceptable than Connally." Rackman compared Connally with Amalek, another foe of the Jewish people:

"Remember Amalek," we are told. "Don't forget." Eradicate him from the face of the earth. Simply because Amalek had no respect for us. He encountered us in his path and casually sought to exterminate us as vermin.

It is my fervent prayer that American Jewry will not minimize the importance of the challenge they have been given and will act speedily and with devastating effectiveness.

Now bear in mind that these words came from the pen of a Jewish clergyman—a spiritual leader of the Jewish people! And as an Orthodox rabbi he might be deemed by many religious people of all faiths as being among "the purest of the pure"—firmly and unhesitatingly devoted to the ancient teachings of the Jewish people.

And note too that Rackman was not just any rabbi. No kosher butcher he, Rackman had not only served as the rabbi of the famed Fifth Avenue Synagogue in Manhattan but was also president of the New York Board of Rabbis and as president of the Rabbinical Council of America. Later he became provost of Yeshiva University in New York—one of the leading Jewish institutions of higher education in America—and in his final years served as president and chancellor of Israel's Bar-Illan University which later named its law center after him—hardly an honor, one would think, that should be conferred upon an individual who had called for the murder of a prominent American political figure.

What makes this affair so particularly extraordinary is that the story of Rackman's threat against Connally received absolutely no coverage in the mainstream media at the time.

In fact, to the best of my knowledge, there were only two newspapers (outside of the Jewish community press) to report the matter—Liberty Lobby's weekly newspaper, *The Spotlight*, and Dr. Edward Field's lively Georgia-based monthly, *The Thunderbolt*—and one magazine, the English-language Mexican-based *Cedade*.

Imagine the media frenzy today if a Muslim imam called for the assassination of an American presidential candidate! It would be broadcast 24/7 and the subject of endless news stories and commentary,

investigated by all police and intelligence agencies, and rallies would be held across the land calling for the immolation of the imam.

So this personal experience—watching the presidential candidate whom I worked for and whom I admired immensely—being subjected to a very real threat from a respected Jewish leader gave me some very real insights: not only into the attitude of the Jewish community toward those whom they perceived to be enemies, but also the manner in which the mass media chose to suppress important news that—in a shocking and definitive way—reflected negatively upon Israel and its American supporters. How could anyone doubt that the Jews did control the mass print and broadcast media in America?

In any event, the Connally campaign came to an end, and shortly thereafter, beginning on June 8, 1980, I began working part-time (and then ultimately full-time, even as a student) on the staff of Liberty Lobby on Capitol Hill in Washington. And with Liberty Lobby being an unabashed critic of the Jewish lobby and of the insane U.S. policies in the Middle East—which had attracted me to the populist institution in the first place—I once again got a first-hand, on-the-scene course in hard-core political realities.

And, during that same time frame—on an even more personal level—I also got an "inside" view of the Jewish world and its outlook toward "The Other." And this was a revelation, even for someone (me) who had schooled himself in the Middle East question.

During the summer of 1980 (at the time I began working for Liberty Lobby) a college friend of mine invited me to share a house on Capitol Hill with another student, one Steve Israel, who was then working as a legislative assistant for a Jewish congressman from New York.

Steve was a likeable sort and he and I had been in a class together, one on foreign policy, conducted by a rambunctious old professor, Ralph Purcell, who was a friend of the Saudi ambassador and (not surprisingly) a very big critic of Israel (the nation) and U.S. policy thereto.

I recall one particular class where the professor drove Steve and the other (largely Jewish) students in the class crazy with a fervent critique of U.S. Middle East policy.

And although Steve knew my views on his favorite foreign nation, that didn't interfere with our casual friendship.

And, for whatever it's worth, it just so happens that the university I attended had a reported on-campus population of Jewish students numbering nearly 40%, a consequence of which was that I had a number of Jewish friends with whom I socialized, even discussing my views on Israel, much, of course, to their distaste. But I pulled no punches and, I suppose, they respected me in a grudging way for my candor. And I dis-

covered, too—and not incidentally—that there were many other non-Jewish students who shared my views but they were (not surprisingly) less forthright in discussing the topic in the manner that I did.

In any case, while rooming on Capitol Hill with Steve Israel, I learned two things (at least):

1) that Jews, according to Steve, referred to African-Americans as “schwarzers” (a term I later discovered was the Yiddish equivalent of what we know as “the ‘n’ word”) and that Jews used that word, according to Steve, “so that they [that is, African-Americans] don’t know we [that is, Jews] are talking about them”; and

2) there was a secret “Jewish world” on Capitol Hill that non-Jews were not really supposed to know about.

Let me explain. One evening, after work, Steve came home and excitedly told me that he had just been promoted in the office of Rep. Richard Ottinger. He told me that his new title was “legislative assistant for foreign affairs.” Later, I heard Steve talking on the telephone with his mother, describing his promotion. He stopped speaking for a moment and then, in apparent response to something his mother said, he replied: “legislative assistant for *Jewish* affairs.” (My emphasis.)

In other words, Steve’s *real* title—in that Jewish congressman’s office—was “legislative assistant for Jewish affairs” but for the consumption of the public it was something less direct. Steve was not just “bragging” for the benefit of his Jewish mother. He was simply telling her *the truth about what his title really was*.

In short, the Jewish elements on Capitol Hill were running what might be called a “secret” government—call it a “parallel” government, if you will—that was supposed to be isolated from the knowledge of “the Goyim”—that ancient term of Jewish tradition referring to Gentiles (non-Jews) that Steve Israel used in conversations with me quite freely and regularly, with no shame whatsoever, despite the fact that the word is not exactly a term of endearment. Roughly translated, as we’ve seen, “Goyim” is the equivalent of “beast” (more specifically, “cattle”). And that says something about what Jews believe about non-Jews, to say the least.

All of this—you see—was very much a learning experience and, to tell you the truth, it actually gave me a chill down my spine. It was as though what I suspected for so long was indeed the truth: Jewish folks were different. They thought differently from non-Jews and, in their own realm, they were conducting a covert agenda for their own ends.

My other room-mate and I parted ways with Steve who was conniving (for his own reasons) to break the lease on the house and it came to a bitter end with Steve refusing to return our security deposits. However, thanks to an ingenious measure by my other room-mate—

who remains my best friend to this day—Steve was convinced that the return of the security deposits was in both his interests and ours.

After college—by the way—Steve went on to work for the American Jewish Committee and later founded a partially-publicly-funded Institute on the Law and the Holocaust. Ultimately he was elected to Congress, as a Democrat, from a district on Long Island and emerged as one of the most powerful members of the House of Representatives.

Following the Democratic defeat in the 2010 elections he was a serious candidate to replace Nancy Pelosi as Democratic leader (had she declined to seek the post) and, in the end, Pelosi appointed him as chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, responsible for raising money and recruiting Democratic House candidates across America. Described by an unnamed source on *The Washington Post*’s Internet blog as being “cold-blooded,” Steve is considered a “moderate” but the state of Israel is very much his most heart-felt concern.

In light of Steve’s current status—in conjunction with his very correct decision to return our security deposits (mentioned above)—this is why I have been known to say that “Steve Israel is the only congressman I’ve ever blackmailed.”

Needless to say, I learned quite a bit from my association with this young man who rose to the heights of American (and Jewish) power. Just another of those experiences that brought me to where I am today.

In the years that followed, working for Liberty Lobby (and then later *American Free Press*) I immersed myself in the topic of U.S. policy toward Israel and focused extensively, in my writings, on the intrigues of the pro-Israel lobby, during which time I assembled a personal library of some 10,000 books, many of which were related to those issues, and most of which, it might be added, were written by Jews and by those sympathetic to the interests of Israel.

I learned quite a bit, and much of what I learned went beyond the issue of Israel and extended into the realm of Jewish history and teachings. And all of what I learned confirmed my deepening feeling that things were not just right; that Jewish power was an unpleasant reality that must reckoned with if the American system was to be reformed.

Now in 1985 I learned something else that must be mentioned. At that point in time I was engaged in what had been an ongoing feud with my former friend, the aforementioned educator, Ruth Cramer Waters, the same lady who was the first adult (aside from my Uncle Bob) to talk to me about Jewish power in America. The conflict between Ruth and me had even become a bit of a *cause celebre* in my hometown and it continued even after I had moved on to Washington, D.C. and, having finished college, was working permanently and full-time for Liberty Lobby,

What happened was this. In an unguarded moment—I learned from a reliable source—Ruth had mentioned (perhaps even bragged) that “The Jews came up here to find out more about Mike Piper,” and evidently Ruth had provided them at least some information that they wanted to know. When Ruth said “the Jews” I knew exactly whom she meant: the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith.

Just a year before that, the ADL had publicly mentioned me, for the first time, in one of their unending “exposes” of “anti-Semitism.” In this case, it was in a report on the Populist Party, a third party that Liberty Lobby, my employer, had set in motion and in which I had been a key player, working in the national office in Washington.

I had first seen the ADL report mentioning me when it was personally handed to me by one Roy Edward Bullock who—it was revealed, some seven years later in 1992, by *The San Francisco Examiner*—had been a longtime undercover informant for the ADL.

Roy had visited Liberty Lobby on a number of occasions and I had met him elsewhere at public events in Washington where (I subsequently realized) he was doing ADL dirty work.

Now while I personally liked Roy, I had come to suspect that he was an ADL operative—pretty much at the time he presented the ADL document to me—and later, in 1986, I wrote an article in *The Spotlight* exposing him as such, after having been tipped off to Bullock’s ADL status by my employer, Willis Carto.

However, although Roy denied his ADL affiliation at the time, he was subsequently exposed (in the course of a major scandal involving ADL spying operations) as the intelligence operative he was. And I have to pat myself on the back for having figured him out, which is what led me, in the first place, to ask Willis about Bullock. Willis was surprised when I told him I knew Bullock and you can imagine my surprise when Willis said flatly: “He’s ADL,” confirming my own concerned suspicions.

And for more on those adventures with Bullock you’ll find the whole story in Chapter Twenty-Nine in this book and for a full-length report on the ADL spy scandal itself you might check out my book *The Judas Goats: The Enemy Within*.

In any case, obviously, I knew that my life and work had been under the scrutiny of the ADL, but when Ruth Cramer Waters confirmed it in a private conversation that came to my attention, you can certainly understand how much it did rattle me, to put it lightly.

Here I was—just 25 years old—and the most loathsome Jewish group in America was putting me under surveillance, to the point that they had even gone to my little home town and interviewed one of my former teachers who also happened to be one of my personal enemies!

If there is any doubt about the nature of the ADL’s operations, that story alone should demonstrate precisely how vile (and to be honest, how thorough and well-informed) they really are.

Well, time passed and—believe it or not—Ruth and I eventually buried the hatchet at a public gathering (to the point that several photographers even captured the historic moment on film) and I never brought the ADL matter up to her. I knew that the ADL was just “doing its job,” so to speak, but it was at that point that I realized, for absolutely certain, that I had crossed the Rubicon and that whatever I did in the future I truly had to commit myself—full force—to taking on the Jews and their New World Order agenda.

I could not turn back, even if I wanted to do so. I was a marked man and, in a sense, it was a certain relief to know that what I had always believed to be true about the ADL and the Jewish agenda was precisely what I had suspected. They were my enemy and they were watching me closely and I resolved to be their worst enemy, never shying away from tackling them head on. It actually gave me energy and inspiration to do my best to defeat them and in the years that followed, I have dedicated myself to doing just that. It’s a dirty job but somebody has to do it.

While much more could be written about the past thirty years in which I have found myself exploring Jewish intrigues, the publication (in 1994) of my first book—*Final Judgment*—was the pivotal event in my career, establishing me, to a small degree, with some prominence. That book contends that, as a result of John F. Kennedy’s energetic efforts to stop Israel from building nuclear weapons of mass destruction that Israel’s intelligence service, the Mossad—acting in concert with sympathetic elements in the CIA and the Jewish crime syndicate—had played a front-line role in the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

That I even wrote the book is ironic inasmuch as—some years before I commenced writing it—my mother suggested to me that, as a result of my long-standing interest in the assassination (going back to my grade school years) that I should write a book on that topic. However, at the time, I told my mother that I didn’t see the need for any such book. As far as I was concerned, the case was closed: JFK had been killed as a result of a conspiracy by elements of the CIA in concert with “the Mafia” (as I naively referred, then, to the international crime syndicate dominated by Jewish mob chief Meyer Lansky).

However, as a consequence of my interest in the Middle East, I discovered there was one aspect of JFK’s foreign policy that was not explored at all in published material on the subject of his assassination: the fact of JFK’s secret war with Israel over the nuclear bomb. It was not until 1991 that I first became aware of the conflict between JFK and

Israel. It was at that time that Seymour Hersh's book, *The Samson Option*—a history of Israel's nuclear weapons program—and Andrew and Leslie Cockburn's *Dangerous Liaison*—an account of U.S. relations with Israel—were published.

These books detailed JFK's struggle with Israel that had otherwise been ignored in not only the many thousands of works relating to his assassination but also in those many other volumes relating to JFK's foreign policy. And in the period that followed, I began to explore the matter, discovering that—in fact—as far back as 1984 author Stephen Green, in his book, *Taking Sides: America's Secret Relations With a Militant Israel*, had already delved into that topic, a point I had missed when I read the book (and actually interviewed Green) at the time.

All of this—taken together with the entanglement of Liberty Lobby in a lawsuit filed against the populist institution by ex-CIA figure E. Howard Hunt (objecting to an article in *The Spotlight* which linked him to the circumstances surrounding the JFK assassination)—stimulated my interest in the matter further.

Then, with the concurrent release in 1991 of the book *Plausible Denial*—by veteran JFK assassination investigator Mark Lane (who successfully represented Liberty Lobby in the Hunt case and who detailed the history of that case in that volume)—and the widespread frenzy over Oliver Stone's film, *JFK*, which brought new interest in the assassination, I started taking a new look at the events of November 22, 1963.

And so it was that—even to my surprise—*Final Judgment* materialized, quickly establishing itself as a proverbial underground best-seller, ultimately being published overseas in Arabic and Japanese and in English in Malaysia and thus setting the stage for my own wide-ranging travel to places such as Russia, Malaysia, Japan, Abu Dhabi and Iran where audiences were not loathe to discuss the possibility that JFK fell victim to Israel's perfidy as a result of his efforts to stop that country from acquiring a nuclear arsenal.

In fact, my many experiences that came about as a result of my writing of *Final Judgment* and the efforts to publicize it had a further impact of increasing my knowledge of Israel and the problems relating to immense Jewish power in America.

It is—I assure you—no coincidence that Oliver Stone's film on the JFK assassination ignored JFK's conflict with Israel over nuclear weapons. It wasn't even until after *Final Judgment* was first published that I learned that the "money man"—the producer—behind Stone's film was Arnon Milchan, not only one of the biggest arms dealers in Israel but also a key player in Israel's nuclear weapons program.

So *Final Judgment* laid the groundwork for my future book-length

writings on a wide-ranging array of topics that, in the end, were all related quite directly to the topic of Israel and Jewish power in America.

The tragedy of September 11, 2001—needless to say—further intensified my involvement in the matter of U.S. policy in the Middle East. Like millions of other Americans, my first reaction on the morning of September 11, upon learning of the events that were taking place in New York City and at the Pentagon—just a few miles from my home on Capitol Hill in Washington—was to "reach out and touch someone." So I called my brother at his home in Pennsylvania—not far, in fact, from the location of where United Airlines Flight 93 was soon to come to an untidy end. My sister-in-law answered the phone and I blurted out what was foremost in my mind. "Well," I said, "they did it."

At this juncture I was assuming that Arab or Muslim terrorists fed up with U.S. favoritism toward Israel were responsible for the attacks. I was suggesting to my sister-in-law that it was essentially the fault of the Israelis—and their powerful lobby in America—that the tragedy had happened. Had it not been for U.S. policy, I was asserting implicitly, the attacks would never have taken place.

However, my sister-in-law didn't read my comments that way. She responded, laughing, and said, "Oh, you think the Jews did this?"

Knowing that, for many years, I had been considered a somewhat "notorious" critic of Israel and of the Jewish lobby in America, my sister-in-law was assuming, perhaps, the worst—or rather, the most likely.

And it was then that it hit me.

What my sister-in-law had presumed were my suspicions was precisely what I did believe, although, until that moment—surprisingly, in retrospect—I never realized it myself.

And I responded, "No, what I meant was that America's all-out pro-Israel policies resulted in a backlash by the Arabs and that Arab terrorists did this.

"But," I continued, "the more I think about it, I do believe that Israel is behind this. They did this to turn America against the Arab world. This is precisely the kind of thing Israel would do. And mark my words, there's going to be evidence that Israel was behind it, even if they cover up the truth, just as they did with the Kennedy assassination."

We closed our conversation and later, along with the rest of my colleagues at the Capitol Hill office of *American Free Press*, I was glued to television and radio for the rest of the afternoon—with an occasional glance at the Internet—and waiting, wondering what was to come next. Certainly, the whole world was watching.

I heard local news reports about a car bomb exploding near the Pentagon. Now, today, the official story is that "it was only a rumor." And

I heard the local news reports describing a fire at the Old Executive Office Building, next to the White House. Today, again, that's just "another rumor." It seems that everything and anything that didn't ultimately match the official version of events was a "rumor"—more often than not, they said, "a rumor from the Muslim world."

But this was just the beginning. That historic day, I watched thousands of frightened federal workers streaming down Pennsylvania Avenue on Capitol Hill, on foot and in their vehicles, fleeing Washington into the suburbs, not knowing whether further attacks lay ahead.

This was quite a chilling sight, made all the more unsettling because it was a bright, sunny, really beautiful day, one of the most lovely days we had all summer—hardly a day (one would think) that could mark the first day of the last days of mankind.

That evening, as the sun was going down and I was making my way back up Pennsylvania Avenue—going in the very direction of the U.S. Capitol now said to have been one of the original terrorist targets—I surveyed the eerily empty street before me and I turned to my colleague, Willis A. Carto, who was walking with me, and I commented, with a sigh, "Well, if there's one thing for certain, it's this: the world will never be the same again."

Carto nodded his head and remarked with a notably somber look on his face, "You can say that again."

And although many others did say that same thing over and over again, probably few realized how uncannily correct and profound that assessment turned out to be . . . in many more ways than one.

Based on my own study—and certainly on the diligent research of so many others—I do believe (beyond any question) that Israel was the driving force behind the 9-11 tragedy, a point I have driven home in everything I have written about the topic beginning with the first issue of *American Free Press* published in the days following the tragedy. I have never veered from that belief nor do I expect to do so. Victor Thorn's pivotal work on the topic of Israeli involvement, *9-11 Evil*, is the best and most succinct summary of the subject available today.

Even granting, for the sake of argument, the conventional view that the 9-11 conspiracy was the work of "them Moozlims," the bottom line still (relying on that theme) is that the 9-11 tragedy was a direct outgrowth of the U.S. involvement in the Middle East, specifically, U.S. favoritism for Israel.

But, as I said, I do not believe that "them Moozlims" did it. At the least, any involvement by genuine Muslim fundamentalists angry at U.S. policy was ultimately directed from behind the scenes by Israeli intelligence in collaboration with pro-Israel traitors on American soil.

And the irony here is that (even today) there are those pro-Israel voices in the media who will insist that U.S. foreign policy had nothing to do with stimulating angry Muslims to attack America. No, they say, "them Moozlims" don't like the American way. They don't like women wearing short skirts and revealing blouses. They don't like McDonalds. They don't like democracy. And on and on and on.

I recall that on the day after the 9-11 attacks an innocent caller to a local radio station in Washington, DC was berated by a self-righteous talk show host for offending the listeners for actually suggesting that Muslim opposition to U.S. foreign policy—some call it "blowback"—may have triggered the 9-11 attacks. That was beyond the pale, according to the host, and an insult to the 3,000 Americans who died.

And even more so, I remember that same day hearing even Washington area radio talk show host Diane Rehm—who happens to be an Arab-American—suggesting (in response to a caller) that she had never heard of the concept of "Christian Zionism" (which the caller had suggested was a critical factor in U.S. support for Israel, which, he contended, probably played a part in causing the 9-11 attacks).

It was clear to me that—although Ms. Rehm is a very smart lady—she simply didn't have the guts to bear the responsibility of lending any of her own considerable public credibility to allowing even the hint of a discussion of U.S. support for Israel being linked (in any way) to the subject of the 9-11 terrorist attacks. So she claimed total ignorance and denied ever having even heard the term "Christian Zionism." Seriously.

And since 9-11, of course, the United States has dived ever more deeply into the Middle East. And no matter how hard I might try, it is absolutely impossible—now more than ever—to ignore the topic of Jewish power. My critics say I am "obsessed" with the subject. And that is absolutely true. I make no apologies or excuses whatsoever.

I simply see no need for the American people to sacrifice their sons and daughters in what the late British nationalist, Arnold Leese, referred to as "Jewish Wars of Survival." These wars are not in America's interests and are a threat to America's survival. They are bankrupting my country and bringing it to disgrace in the eyes of the world.

And the unswerving allegiance to Israel by the United States—dictated by the Jewish lobby—is setting the course for what can only be future war (even nuclear war). All of this, in the end, poses a danger to all of the people on this planet.

The one thing which is consistent about U.S. Middle East policy is the fact that it is based on lies, bullying and double standards. This policy must be cast to the winds. Jewish power must be vanquished—before it's too late. Of that one thing, I tell you, I am certain.

Of course, much more could be said, but I won't belabor the point. So this has been my very long (and very personal) answer to the question as to how I have come to be immersed in (and identified with) the Problem of anti-Semitism, the Jewish Question, the Jewish Problem—call it what you will.

Having traveled all over the world and meeting so many fine people who share my concerns and having had the opportunity to study this matter on so many levels, I am convinced that, ultimately, there will be a final solution to the problem.

For the present, though, it is our responsibility to consider the matter of anti-Semitism in all of its many complex facets, and that's the goal I have sought to achieve in the pages of this book.

I would like to think that perhaps I've brought some peace of mind to some people in so doing, helping them understand that what is often called "anti-Semitism" is not "anti-" anything, but, often times, simply what we might call "Gentile self-defense"—a reaction to Jewish attitudes and actions that, on a broad range of issues, have created situations which Jewish people have found to be "anti-Semitism."

In no conscious way have I ever sought to offend or upset any Jewish person through my writings—except, of course, the likes of those creatures such as Abe Foxman of the ADL and others of his ilk who deserve no respect. I have always treated all people as human beings as long as they have acted as such—and it's safe to say that Mr. Foxman cannot be considered a member of the human race. If anything, I reserve a certain amount of pity for those Jews who are obsessed with "anti-Semitism" and who refuse to come down to earth and join the community of mankind.

And on that note, I will conclude this extended exposition on my own journey in this realm by relating to you my personal encounter with no less than Abe Foxman himself.

It took place several years ago, right on Capitol Hill in Washington. I happened to be dining at one of my favorite spots, the Taverna, a deservedly-popular Greek restaurant (now sadly closed). I was sitting at the front of the restaurant and in the rear, talking loudly, were a man and a woman. I heard one of them make reference to "B'nai B'rith" and this captured my attention. Their voices carried over the din of the late afternoon crowd and it became apparent to me that the two had some association with B'nai B'rith and that they were talking about some lucrative real estate deal involving that powerful Jewish agency.

In any case, as I awaited the arrival of my meal, I happened to look up and into the restaurant came a plump, full-faced older man who stopped just several feet from me. He looked to the rear of the restau-

rant in the direction of the B'nai B'rith duo, smiled brightly, spread his arms as if to say, "Here I am," and then proceeded to join the couple. It was at that moment I realized the new diner was no less than Abe Foxman himself. I determined, then and there, that I would definitely speak to him, but I was not about to interrupt his dinner and possibly cause a scene. However, I did not intend to approach him in a negative fashion (although I certainly had reason to do so).

So I finished up my meal, rushed to my nearby apartment to put on a nice sportcoat and returned back to Pennsylvania Avenue and took up a spot at an outdoor coffee shop a door away from the restaurant. And not much more than an hour later I saw Foxman and his companions leave the restaurant and part company. I moved.

Approaching Foxman as he casually strolled past me, I stepped up and said in a friendly voice, "Aren't you Mr. Foxman?" He barely stopped—if at all—and instead tried to push ahead through the dinner-time after-work crowds there on Pennsylvania Avenue near the Capitol complex. His eyes flashed and he said, "No, no, no," as he sought to disengage from me. I asked, "You're not Abe Foxman?" (again in a friendly and gentle voice), and—as he literally scurried on up the street—he repeated, in a harried, insistent tone: "No, no, no."

But it *was* Abe Foxman. I don't think he knew who I was. But what I do know is that here was this powerful Jew, who has always relished public attention rushing to the microphones and news cameras to grab his much-more-than-five-minutes-of-fame, denying his own identity.

It was very simple, I realized: Although Foxman feels free and clear to defame people and wage covert campaigns against them, using his considerable power to do so, when—in a simple moment on the street—someone knew who he was and he was not surrounded by his bodyguard and entourage—he didn't even have the guts to acknowledge he was indeed that same Abe Foxman who is a familiar figure in the global print and broadcast media.

I'm not an ogre in appearance or manner—most people say I'm very friendly and some even say I'm quite handsome—and I bathe daily. But Abe Foxman was not in control of the situation and he was absolutely terrified about that fact.

So this loud-mouthed, pushy, threatening, arrogant thug—who has the murderers of Israel's Mossad at his disposal, not to mention the vast resources of the Jewish-controlled media and the slavish support of bought-and-paid-for politicians—didn't have the guts to face a stranger.

At that moment I knew then, if I had never known it before, that I had made the right decision to confront the lies, bullying and double-standards that this one creature so ably represents. And that says it all.



Shown above are some of the internationally-published foreign language editions of various works by Michael Collins Piper. Clockwise: The Malay edition of *The New Jerusalem*; the Arabic edition of *Final Judgment*; the Japanese edition of *Final Judgment*; the Japanese edition of *The High Priests of War*; the Malay edition of *The High Priests of War*; and the Arabic edition of *The High Priests of War*.

CHAPTER NINE

Not for the Feint of Heart: Confronting the Secret (And Not-So-Secret) History of the Jewish Role in American and World Affairs

All of the books that I have written have, in one context or another, emphasized the point that Jewish influence in our world today—most especially the role of the Jewish lobby in Washington and its allies in the mass media and their combined intrigue in misdirecting U.S. foreign policy (not to mention, of course, the grand schemes of Israel itself—could (and will) bring a nuclear conflagration to our planet if their pernicious influence is not soon brought to an end.

Writing about such troublesome issues is, to be honest, no way to “win friends and influence people.” Quite in contrast it is a sure guarantee of accumulating a lot of very powerful enemies. But it has been a remarkable process through which I have learned so much about how the world really works and, more so, about why America is in the perilous state of affairs in which it finds itself.

Now what I have always found particularly amusing is the fact that some of my critics—and not all of them Jewish, by the way—have suggested that I have been “obsessed” with The Jewish Question.

Well, I cheerfully plead guilty to the charge, for I believe Jewish influence is the paramount American (and world) political issue of our times. But I hasten to point out—in response to the suggestion my so-called obsession is somehow out of bounds—what a Jewish writer, Adam Garfinkle, cited earlier, wrote in his book *Jewcentricity: Why the Jews Are Praised, Blamed, and Used to Explain Just About Everything*:

If it's about Jews, it's news. From celebrities, conspiracy theorists, to American presidential candidates railing against anti-Semitism to the occasional news factoid that some person of interest has just discovered heretofore unknown Jewish relatives, nearly everyone wants to talk about it. Are the Jews God's Chosen People? Many Jews and non-Jews alike, think so. And about what other group is that question even asked?

In short, Jews are News—and if truth be told, they love it. Likewise, Jewish writer Phyllis Chesler—in her aforementioned 2003 rant—*The New Anti-Semitism: The Current Crisis and What We Must Do About It*—stated flatly that “The Jewish Question is that perpetual elephant in the living room of the world.”

So with such esteemed Jewish writers acknowledging the widespread interest in subjects related to Jewish affairs, I feel no need to apologize for having used my capacity (however prolix) to put words onto paper toward the purpose of trying to understand the nature of anti-Semitism and other questions surrounding the Jewish role in American and world affairs—both past and present.

In that regard, at this juncture, an overview of some of my earlier works is probably in order, inasmuch as it provides us a framework upon which to reflect further upon the issue of "Anti-Semitism" as we have been examining it (especially from my own unique—I think—perspective) as put forth in this present volume.

More importantly, though, the record of my book-length writings is—and I suggest this most humbly—a fairly good accounting of not only the secret (and not-so-secret) history of the Jewish role in American and world affairs (today and yesterday) but also of how this influence (which I believe to be most malign) will play out in the future course of mankind—however unfortunately limited that future may be.

In fact, I would go so far as to say that it will be the issue of Jewish power that, when ultimately decided, one way or the other, will be *the very issue that determines the survival of mankind*.

Earlier in the opening pages of this volume I referenced my book, *The New Babylon: Those Who Reign Supreme*. This book was a broadly-expanded and considerably more historically-based exposition of the theme of an earlier work *The New Jerusalem: Zionist Power in America*, which focused almost exclusively on cold, hard facts and figures (taken from Jewish sources) providing a solid look at the massive extent of Jewish political and economic influence in the United States.

Many people who read *The New Jerusalem* told me that they had long known Jewish power in America was immense, but until they read this book, they never had any idea of precisely *how* immense it was.

The New Babylon, however, worked back through world history to the era when the Jewish religion (as we know it today) first began emerging into the historic record and demonstrated, most readers would say conclusively, that the origins of what we now call the New World Order had its beginnings in the Jewish teachings known as the Talmud that today underscore the Jewish agenda.

The book explored the first stirrings of the Jewish money power and its utmost culmination in the rise—and rise—of the House of Rothschild which ultimately captured control of international finance and, most especially, came to dominate what is known in history to be the "British" empire but which—as *The New Babylon* demonstrated—was really, in fact, a "Yiddish" empire, so to speak.

And from that point, of course, the Rothschild Empire—the New Pharisees—expanded onto American shores, to the point that, in many very real respects, the United States has emerged as the imperial engine of the global Jewish elite—operating in the Rothschild sphere of influence—in the drive for the New World Order: the Jewish Utopia.

The other books that I have written have all considered—in one form or another—various aspects of how the New World Order influence of the Rothschild Empire has impacted on American and world affairs, focusing on different facets of this malign force.

• *Final Judgment* explained how President John F. Kennedy was assassinated for having the fortitude to stand up to the government of Israel and its powerful lobby in America, working relentlessly to prevent Israel from assembling nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

Had JFK not been removed from office, he might have succeeded in his goal and, consequently, prevented Israel from emerging as the blackmailing global super-power that this tiny entity is today.

And, at the same time, Israel's American lobby would have been effectively checkmated, with a determined president standing in the way of the Zionism's now-virtually-unquestioned drive to achieve absolute power over our political system.

The fact that Israel played such a critical—really, primary—role in the assassination of John F. Kennedy is not as well known today as it should be. There is no doubt that if more and more Americans became aware of how and why JFK died that there would be a major reassessment (at least by the American people) of their attitudes toward unswerving U.S. support for the international Zionist cause. So *Final Judgment* is there with the facts that need to be told.

• *The High Priests of War* was the first full length (and, I might add, only totally candid) assessment of the history of the so-called "neo-conservative" network and how it accumulated so much influence to the point that it was able—with the fanatically willing support of an American president, who is almost certainly mentally unbalanced—to direct the United States into a war that need not and should not have been fought. This war that doesn't seem to have any end in sight and Americans are (rightly) becoming restless with the calamity in Iraq, despite their efforts to "be patriotic and support the president."

Many Americans are now realizing that the war is not in America's interests and never was, that it was based upon horrendous lies, and that there is, in fact, another agenda behind the war: namely the demands of Israel (and Zionism at large) on the American system. Growing recognition of this reality, in the end, will play a major part in helping create a mindset among the American people who finally will be able to reflect

upon what the war really means and who made it happen—and why. *So The High Priests of War* is there with the facts that need to be told.

As long as Zionism has a stranglehold on the American media (and the political power that arises as a consequence), the people of the United States can expect to see more and more American boys and girls being dispatched around the globe to fight wars and be killed or horribly wounded fighting on behalf of Zionist interests that are shamelessly and deceitfully hiding behind the American flag.

We can expect higher taxes to pay for these wars, and more and more political repression at home designed to silence the dissidents who dare to say “no” to Zionism’s demands on the American people. The list of likely consequences of all of this is frightening indeed. However, as more and more Americans come to learn of the immense Zionist influence, there will be a corresponding increase in public (not just private) discussion of this dangerous phenomenon.

- *The Golem*—subtitled “Israel’s Nuclear Hell Bomb and the Road to Global Armageddon”—constituted a study of the “Israelization” of American foreign policy and its consequences for the future of mankind in the context of the frightening reality of the existence of Israel’s unchecked nuclear arsenal of weapons of mass destruction. The choice of the title was by no casual chance.

In Jewish lore, a top rabbi magically conjured up out of clay from the earth a brutish creature—“the Golem”—that the rabbi unleashed upon the world to vanquish the enemies of the Jewish people. According to the legend—which later inspired Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*—the Golem got out of control and proved even a threat to Jewish survival. In fact, a most real (and dangerous) Golem exists on our planet today.

Cast out of the element uranium, this Golem is—as Israel’s founding father, David Ben-Gurion, described it—Israel’s “sacred” nuclear weapon, the primary source of trouble in the realm of atomic proliferation. Our world is thus held hostage, facing untold danger as a result of American collaboration with nuclear-armed Israel, a nation which has an open historical record of religious-based hostility to non-Jews—a philosophy upon which Israel—since its earliest days—has worked relentlessly to construct an atomic arsenal, its Golem, the very foundation of Israel’s national security strategy known as “The Samson Option.”

In other words, like Samson of the Bible, Israel is willing to bring down the temple—in this case, the temple of mankind—in an act of suicide, nuclear suicide, that is.

- *The Judas Goats*—subtitled “The Shocking Story of the Infiltration and Subversion of the American Nationalist Movement”—demonstrated that since World War II there has been a fervent drive by

the Zionist movement to eviscerate the nationalist movement in America and other nationalist forces around the globe and that, in America at least, since the middle half of the 20th century, those who called themselves “conservatives” have seen the conservative movement (the traditional base of American nationalism) infiltrated and destroyed from within. The process was long in the making, but ultimately successful, as history and current events demonstrate.

While many writers thoroughly explored the tentacles of the Rothschild empire as it encircled the planet, creating war, economic havoc and revolution (profiting therefrom), there had never been—until the advent of *The Judas Goats*—a comprehensive review of the manner in which this dynasty (and the Zionist movement which it nurtured) worked to destroy the American nationalists who stood in the way of their ultimate goal of achieving their New World Order.

However, the process of infiltration and destruction of the “conservative” movement—which, historically, at least until the mid-20th century, was the foundation for American opposition to the intrigue of the international plutocratic elite—involved much more than the corruption of the conservative philosophy.

In fact, this ugly scenario also included the utilization of U.S. government-paid *agents provocateurs*, acting in concert with professional infiltrators and subversives working for “independent” (that is, foreign) intelligence agencies operating on American soil.

What effectively took place was a classic “pincer movement” scenario that left traditional American nationalism gutted and eviscerated. A vibrant guiding philosophy—first set forth by American giants such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson and a others who followed in their footsteps—was thus cast to the winds.

The Judas Goats was the first-ever study of its kind, providing a framework for understanding the tactics of these Enemies Within, and how and why they were able to advance the Jewish dream goal of claiming dominance of the American system and making it their military and economic tool for world conquest.

So while the traditional “conservative” movement was subverted and made into a force for internationalism as opposed to nationalism, there are still stalwart nationalists—even including some self-described “progressives” and “liberals”—who continue to fight the good fight.

Ultimately, if there was one thing this book should have made absolutely clear, it is precisely this: the old labels of “left” and “right” and “liberal” and “conservative” must be abandoned forever.

These archaic labels are not only divisive and troublesome, but they are part and parcel of a Grand Design to split the American people—and

the peoples of the world—and ensure the continuing control of our America—and the nations of this planet—in the hands of a grasping, greedy, self-interested global plutocracy.

- *Target Traficant*—the shocking story of how sordid elements inside the Justice Department (allied with the Jewish lobby) conspired to bring down an outspoken populist congressman—Jim Traficant of Ohio—by convicting him on trumped-up “corruption” charges was an unsettling account of real-life-power politics inside our so-called “justice” system, demonstrating the extraordinary lengths to which Jewish forces have gone in order to silence their critics and those who have questioned the one-sided U.S. policy in favor of Israel.

The very fact that a member of Congress—wildly popular in his home district and well-known across America for his much-heralded “one minute rants” on the House floor (viewed with enthusiasm by millions over C-SPAN)—could be subjected to flagrantly illegal prosecution for crimes he clearly did not commit is proof positive that Jewish power has run amuck in America.

And it should be noted, too, that the mass media—and yes, at the highest levels, the media is Jewish-controlled—played a major part in putting forth the false claims surrounding the Traficant affair.

Jim Traficant—sad to say—is not the only figure (prominent or otherwise) who has been railroaded into prison or otherwise persecuted in one form or another for raising questions about U.S. policy in the Middle East, nor will he be the last, unless Americans take hold of the reins of power in this country and break the back of Jewish power.

- *Best Witness: The Mel Mermelstein Affair and the Triumph of Historical Revisionism* told the little-known story of how high-powered Jewish lawyers, the Jewish lobby, and the mass media joined to support a self-described “Holocaust Survivor”—one Mel Mermelstein—in waging a relentless campaign of smear-and-fear through the legal system to destroy a group of diligent and open-minded historians and publicists who had dared to raise questions about many of the popular stories and legends surrounding the events of history known as “the Holocaust.”

Although few Americans know it, one can be jailed in at least fourteen nations of “the democratic West” for even suggesting that less than six million Jews were exterminated by “the Nazis.” That is an unpleasant truth, particularly as Jewish forces in America would like to see such draconian thought-control legislation instituted in the United States today.

And while Mr. Mermelstein and his backers have loudly defamed those who have raised questions about the history of the Holocaust as “holocaust deniers,” that label represents anything but the truth. Mermelstein and company would have the world believe that these so-

called “deniers” even deny the existence of the concentration camps of World War II—an astounding and flagrant lie—and, as such, many well-meaning people have recoiled in horror at the very idea that anyone would think such a horrible (and non-sensical) thing.

As we saw earlier, “The Holocaust”—as represented in popular perception, at any rate—is very much an underlying theme in the propaganda of the New World Order. Mr. Mermelstein was but one relatively small player in the big picture surrounding the never-ending talk about “The Holocaust” in the mass media, but his story underscores precisely the manner in which “Hitler and the Nazis” have become a central part of the Jewish onslaught, through the media and the courts of the world, to put their agenda in line to ultimately reign supreme.

Thanks to the efforts of my long-time friend, Willis Carto (with whom I’ve been privileged to work on an intimate basis since 1980 and who has been responsible for publishing all of which I have written), the truth about “The Holocaust”—as opposed to the myths and the lies—has been preserved in millions of words appearing in hundreds of books and magazines and other material that has stood the test of time.

Today, in the pages of *The Barnes Review* (of which Willis is the publisher), one cannot only find the facts about the Holocaust but all manner of remarkable hard-to-find truths that have been suppressed by those whom the late historian, Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes—in whose memory *The Barnes Review* is dedicated—referred to as “the Court Historians,” those bought-and-paid-for shills and propagandists who have done so much to bend history in order to advance the New World Order agenda.

- *Dirty Secrets: Crime, Conspiracy & Cover-Up in the Twentieth Century* (edited by Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani) constitutes a compendium of various writings of mine (as well as the transcripts of a number of interviews conducted with me by Thorn and Guliani) discussing a wide range of topics, ranging from the truth about the Federal Reserve money monopoly, FDR’s foreknowledge of the impending Pearl Harbor attack, the Oklahoma City bombing, political assassinations, the Holocaust, U.S. Middle East policy—a gamut of “controversial” material that challenges the lies and disinformation put forth by the media monopoly in America about so many matters that have been ignored or distorted in a relentless fashion by the Jewish media lords.

All told, over the years, I’ve probably written more than 4,000 different articles published in such newspapers as *The Spotlight* and *American Free Press* and in *The Barnes Review* and engaged in five years of nightly Internet radio broadcasting, so this book is but a small sampling—very small, to say the least—of my work. But I think it represents an important array of little-known information that demonstrates

the need for independent media to exist and prosper. For it can only be through such media that the people of America and the world can finally bring the New World Order to its knees.

There are so many good writers today that it's impossible to name them all. Many have written on the same topics I have. A bibliography of their material could fill up a volume itself and there are so many other areas of discussion that need to be pursued. But I believe my own contributions have added—sometimes considerably—to the debate.

As I have mentioned before, the work that I do is something that I enjoy, but it is not always a pleasant task, considering the extensive name-calling and brickbats that accompany it. But I intend to pursue the work as long as God permits me—and to Hell with my enemies, because I know that is exactly where they are going.

And now, in the pages that follow, I want to bring you further along on my own journey in the murky and often ugly world in which I have found myself immersed. As I promised, it will be interesting.

My first published article was on "anti-Semitism" . . .

Aside from letters to the editors of local newspapers, my first-ever "real" newspaper article actually dealt with "anti-Semitism." Published in Liberty Lobby's newspaper, *The Spotlight*, on Dec. 28, 1981, the article—entitled "Foreigners Read Your Mail," was bylined "Richard V. London." At the time—just 21 years old—I guess I wasn't brave enough to append my own name to the story.

What a story it was! I had gone with Lois Petersen, my good friend from *The Spotlight*, to a conference in Washington sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and there we learned that 72 U.S. Senators had given the ADL privileged access to examine the actual letters the senators received from constituents supporting the Reagan administration's sale of AWACS planes to Saudi Arabia, despite opposition from the Israeli lobby. The ADL wanted to find out if the letters contained comments that were "anti-Semitic."

This was indeed a story. My article emphasized the point that members of Congress had literally turned private mail from American taxpayers over to a lobby for a foreign nation: Israel. If I had never written anything else, I would have been proud of just that single accomplishment, for the story described in that one brief article pinpoints precisely the immense behind-the-scenes influence of organized Jewry in America. And that was 30 years ago! Since then, I've written thousands of articles—not to mention multiple books—related to the topic, but *that article alone said it all.*

CHAPTER TEN

An Urgent Plea to the Jewish People to Join the Community of Mankind . . .

Although the fact is that I have had many fond acquaintances, even friendships, with Jewish folks over these many years—and many of them were fully versed in my complaints about the intrigues of Israel (that foreign nation that so many Jews in America love so much more than they love America, I'm sad to say)—I have never shied away from expressing my views about Israel and about the pernicious influence of the Israeli lobby in America. On the same token, I've encouraged Jews to abandon their steadfast support for Israel (over America) and gently chided them for their devotion to the much-talked-about theme of Jewish "chosen-ness" above all others.

In fact, on one occasion—during the dirtiest days of the Iraq war (and even as the Jewish proponents of that war were already calling for the United States to then invade Iran)—I issued an "Open Letter" to a Jewish American businessman, Phil Panitch, with whom I had become acquainted my years working for Liberty Lobby in Washington.

A friendly and energetic fellow, Phil has long been a popular figure in the restaurants and watering holes on Capitol Hill, near the old Liberty Lobby headquarters, and he was well aware of my work and of my concerns regarding inordinate Jewish power in America.

My Open Letter, republished here, expresses well my point of view in this regard. Readers of the non-Jewish faiths will be particularly interested in Phil's candid description (from a Jewish point of view) of the underlying nature of the Jewish faith. My letter to this Jewish-American businessman reads as follows . . .

A Plea for Jewish Tolerance for Non-Jews and an Invitation for the Jewish People to Join the World Community of Nations.

Dear Phil:

Having known you for some years now, I have found you to be a man of integrity—kindly, humorous and gentle, intelligent and likeable, an entertaining personality indeed.

Although, as you well know, I have been an outspoken human rights and social justice advocate, a no-holds-barred progressive, fiercely critical of the monstrous and terroristic policies of the Middle East militarist state of Zionist Israel, you and I have remained friends nonetheless.

Despite the fact you are a committed Jew, trained in Hebrew schools and devoted to Talmudic Jewish teachings that—as an advocate of equality for all peoples—I heartily and most vociferously reject, I have always held you in high personal regard.

Despite the fact that your Jewish teachings hold that all non-Jews constitute “Goyim”—that non-Jews are essentially “cattle” and less than human—I believe that the Jewish people are free to accept these teachings so long as they do not use that freedom to harm other peoples.

Although I realize your religious teachers told you that we “Goyim” are aliens—the proverbial “other,” the “outsider”—you have never displayed a Talmudic-based bias against me or other Goyim in my presence. And this is to your credit, Phil!

So it is that—despite my knowledge of this Jewish philosophy—never have I allowed my personal disdain for these hostile and dangerous teachings of Judaism to color my view of you as a human being. Nor would I.

However, Phil, there is a very serious problem that must be addressed—and for the sake of the survival of humankind—we must address this problem.

I once asked you to describe the foundation of the Jewish faith to me and you promptly responded: “Self-worship.” I said: “That’s a very truthful answer. I appreciate that. Most Gentiles don’t understand that. I do.” You chuckled.

In other words, you were admitting to me that Judaism worships the Jewish people—NOT GOD as many Christians mistakenly believe.

Sometime later I reminded you of what you had told me and you said, with obvious concern, “Did I tell you that?”

I responded, saying “Yes, and it was, as I said at the time, a very truthful answer.” And you replied: “You know too much.” I said, “I study your people very carefully.” You said, “Yeah, I know you do, and that’s what worries me.”

Phil: It is precisely this “self-worship” that has led the Jewish people and the state of Israel to where we are today . . . On the brink of a devastating world war.

Hard-line Jewish Zionism—support for the state of Israel—threatens to bring America and our planet into a loathsome global conflagration, a true Holocaust in the very sense of the meaning of the word.

This is why I am writing you: The bottom line, Phil, is that

the American Jewish community must now cease and desist in its unending and relentless demand that the “Goyim” of America continue to support Israel.

I implore you:

Please use your influence within the Jewish-American community to ask—no, demand—that the Jewish lobby cease and desist in its efforts to embroil the United States in a disastrous and un-necessary foreign war that is not in America’s interests.

There are many manifestations of anti-Semitism in America today. The president of Harvard has pointed out that even progressive intellectuals are publicly making statements perceived to be “anti-Semitic.” This should be of immense concern to Jewish-Americans.

The Jewish people will be the ones who will suffer if there is a grassroots rebellion in America against the Jewish war-hawks who are demanding that American boys and girls be used as Israel’s cannon fodder in a Hellish war against Iraq and the Arab and Muslim world. [This was written before the attack on Iraq.]

This American rebellion is in its burgeoning stages.

Even now, as this is written, high-ranking elements in the American military are rising in opposition to the efforts by the Jewish lobby to control the Pentagon and thereby force America into a war for Israel.

Phil: The Jewish people are now at a crossroads in their history: Will the Jewish people come down on the side of social justice and human rights or will the Jews be remembered in history as bullies, ogres, tyrants—a plutocratic elite who used their influence at its 21st century pinnacle to advance their own power and influence at the expense of mankind?

The choice is before the Jewish people.

Please make the right choice—for everyone’s sake!

For the Survival of Humankind, I am

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

So that letter expressed my wishes for the future of mankind in general and for the future of the Jewish people specifically. And I am pleased to say that my friend Phil—although he remains a devout Zionist—has since said, “I don’t need the state of Israel to keep me free.” Perhaps my letter had some impact after all!

Jewish Suicide Bombers on 9-11 . . .

Perhaps the most "explosive" newspaper article I ever wrote appeared in *American Free Press* on Dec. 24, 2001, later picked up and republished on December 31 in *Arab News*—a journal of the Saudi Arabian government. The article asked "Were the 9-11 Hijackers Really Arabs?" and suggested they could have been Israeli-sponsored fundamentalist Jewish fanatics who adopted "false flag" identities of "bin Laden Arabs" in order to instigate a U.S. war against the Arab world. After *Arab News* published the article, the U.S. government made an official demand that the Saudis repudiate any suggestion the hijackers were anything other than Arabs. My article apparently hit too close to the mark (and to this day, I think it may very well have been a bulls-eye).

"Jewish suicide bombers? Impossible!" cried critics. However, the fact is there is a "suicide tradition" much-revered in Jewish history, going back to the legendary mass suicide at Masada by Jewish zealots. But in modern times, Israeli suicide missions have been undertaken. Former Mossad officer Victor Ostrovsky described one 1989 venture: the participants were "all volunteers" advised there was "no possibility of rescue should they be caught."

My article noted that in 1986, Victor Vancier, the New York-based leader of the terrorist Jewish Defense League, declared: "If you think the Shiites in Lebanon are capable of fantastic acts of suicidal terrorism, the Jewish underground will strike targets that will make Americans gasp: 'How could Jews do such things?'" Vancier said his allies "don't care if they live or die."

What about the Arabic language heard on one airplane's black box on 9-11? Consider a formerly secret CIA assessment, *Israel: Foreign Intelligence and Security Services*, dated March 1979, which reported that it is a long-standing policy for Israeli intelligence to disguise Jews as Arabs:

One of the established goals of the intelligence and security services is that each officer be fluent in Arabic. . . . Many Israelis have come from Arab countries . . . and appear more Arab than Israeli . . . By forging passports and identity documents of Arab . . . countries and providing sound background legends and cover, Mossad has successfully sent into . . . Arab countries Israelis disguised and documented as Arabs The Israeli talent for counterfeiting or forging foreign passports . . . ably supports the agent's authenticity.

For those who doubt Israel would endanger American Jews via terrorism, consider this: hard-line Israelis are willing to sacrifice Jews if it means assuring Israel's survival. Rabbi Meir Kahane, a spiritual mentor of Israeli fundamentalists, wrote that Jews who refused to "go home" were expendable. The CIA report on Israeli intelligence said this widely-held view mirrors "the aggressively ideological nature of Zionism."

Israeli scholar Ehud Sprinzak said these views are "a major school" of modern Zionist thought and wrote of the powerful rabbi, Israel Ariel, who would risk massive loss of Jewish lives to achieve the "elimination" of the Arab countries to guarantee Israel's survival. The rabbi proclaimed:

A war is permitted as long as no more than one-sixth of the nation be killed. And this was stated in relation to an ordinary war, a fight between neighbors. A war for Eretz Israel does not depend on the number of casualties. The command is 'Ase!' ("Do it!"), and you may be sure that the number of casualties will thus be minimal.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

JFK, 9-11, and the U.S.S. Liberty: Why the Jewish Problem Directly Impacts on America and the Whole World Today . . .

In the course of conducting an internationally-broadcast forum on the Internet (now at michaelcollinspiper.podbean.com) I became known—perhaps infamous—for focusing most particularly on the issue of Israeli influence on U.S. foreign policy and of the problem of Jewish power in America. And if there is anything I've learned it is that even if you have a devoted audience of listeners, one thing for certain is that none of them agree on everything.

On one occasion I had a listener chime in by saying, essentially, that "Americans needs to forget about the JFK assassination and the Israeli attack on the *U.S.S. Liberty* and focus on the 9-11 terrorist attacks. When Americans finally learn what happened on 9-11, that will be the key to turning American politics upside down and breaking the back of the Jewish lobby."

Now as much as I am interested in the JFK assassination—particularly, of course, because of the fact that I've written a reasonably popular book on the topic—I am still nonetheless able to step back and look at the issues of the JFK assassination, the attack on the *Liberty*, and the subsequent 9-11 terrorist tragedy (which I do believe can be traced to Israel) and still conclude that—of these three issues—the attack on the *Liberty* is the one that (perhaps) has the most resonance in trying to bring the issue of inordinate Jewish power in America to the forefront of the American political arena.

What follows is an edited transcript of one of my broadcasts in which I discussed this matter.

There have been three major attacks on America in the last 50 years that are directly traceable to Israel, the so-called "ally" of the United States. In each case, these attacks have changed the course of American (and world) history for the worst.

The first, of course, was the assassination of President John F. Kennedy precisely because JFK stood in the way of Israel's drive to develop nuclear weapons. Had JFK succeeded in stopping Israel from building "The Jewish Hell Bomb," that would have prevented, almost certainly, the U.S. debacle in Iraq and the impending war against Iran both of which have been founded falsely on the theme that Iraq and Iran had, or have, or are or were trying to build a nuclear weapon. The fact is that the only reason why these countries (and others in the Middle East) would have an interest in such weapons was because Israel already had such weapons.

The second event which took place during the last 50 years which can be traced to the intrigues of Israel is the 9-11 terrorist attack on America.

There are those—including some self-styled “patriot” broadcasters and others in the alternative media—who say there’s “no proof” of Israeli involvement, that there’s only suspicion of Israeli involvement.

But we do know that Israel was a beneficiary—in fact, the prime beneficiary—of those attacks. There is a lot of evidence, nonetheless, which points toward Israeli involvement in and orchestration of those attacks.

And that is why there are those who believe that Israel was the ultimate sponsor of those crimes on 9-11.

However, at the very least, for the sake of argument—if we accept the lies of the Bush administration about 9-11 and the lies about 9-11 that have been bandied about in the Zionist-dominated so-called “mainstream” media in America—that the 9-11 attacks were carried out by a group of Muslim extremists who were led (or directed or inspired) by Osama bin Laden, the fact remains that if those Muslims committed the crime, they did it precisely because of the nature of U.S. policy, precisely because U.S. foreign policy is dominated by the Jewish lobby in this country, a lobby which is bankrolled by a handful of pro-Israel Jewish billionaires and who, at the same time, control the mass media in this country at all levels and who use that control to promote their agenda vis-à-vis the state of Israel and their worldwide design on this planet that we refer to generally as “the New World Order,” but which is specifically—as the record shows—the product of an age-old Jewish dream of a global imperium, a dream spawned in the Jewish holy teachings known as the Talmud.

But then we have that third historical event of the last 50 years, the attack on the *USS Liberty* on June 8, 1967 by our ally, Israel: the deliberate murder of American sailors and intelligence officers and military men who were aboard that vessel as it sailed peacefully in the Mediterranean.

In the end, there is one thread that ties together these three pivotal tragedies—other than the fact that they were all Israeli-sponsored—and that is that if somehow even a significant minority of Americans were to know the truth about these events, any single one of these events, properly publicized, would be enough to turn the American political process—specifically in regard to U.S. Middle East policy—upside down.

That is, were enough Americans to know the truth about any single one of these events, there would be—at least one would hope—an all-out revolution in this country against the domination of our U.S. foreign policy by the Jewish lobby.

But there’s another important point here that must be emphasized: there is one thing about the attack on the *USS Liberty* that is unique, absolutely certain, one thing which makes the attack on the *Liberty* so

remarkably relevant; and that is this: although we had an American president killed in 1963 that resulted in a major revolution in U.S. Middle East policy, an absolute 180 degree turnabout in that policy, and despite the fact that on September 11, 2001 we saw the assassination of some 3,000 Americans—resulting in a major change in America at home (the set-up of a functional policy state in the name of “homeland security”) and the involvement in a seemingly endless “war on terrorism” that led not only to the war in Afghanistan and then the war on Iraq and which is now being expanded, in intent, to a war against Iran and possibly other Muslim states—the big difference between the assassination of President Kennedy and the murder of 3,000 Americans and the attack on the *USS Liberty* is this: we really can’t prove that Israel played a role in the JFK assassination or the attack on the World Trade Center.

However, it is abundantly clear that Israel did attack the *USS Liberty*. There’s no question about that. Israel has admitted that it attacked the *USS Liberty*. Israel has not admitted its involvement in the JFK assassination or that it was involved in the 9-11 terrorist attacks. That will never happen.

Why is this important? There is where the issue becomes of paramount significance for the United States and the world today. We do know that the survivors of the *Liberty*—men such as my friends Phil Tournay and Gary Brummett—aren’t making things up out of the whole cloth. We have their testimony. We have the testimony of other sources in the U.S. military, diplomatic and intelligence communities—people from within even the administration of President Lyndon Johnson at the time of the *Liberty* attack—who say that the evidence is unquestionable that Israel’s attack was deliberate, that it was not, as Israel and its defenders claim, a case of mistaken identity, an unfortunate case of “friendly fire during wartime.”

There are those who have suggested that the JFK assassination and the attack on the *Liberty* are in the distant past and that we must focus instead only on the 9-11 attacks if we want to curtail Israeli power over America and over the world itself.

And—ironically—there are likewise those Israelis and defenders of Israel who say we must “move on” and forget about the *USS Liberty*, saying it is “in the past,” who still, at the same time, say we must “never forget” about the Holocaust, those events that took place during World War II—more than 60 years ago.

However, when it comes to the bottom line, it is this: in the case of both the JFK assassination and the events of 9-11, we have major mountains to cross, hurricanes to surpass, blinding dust storms to penetrate. We face a mass media that has convinced millions of Americans of a fraudulent story surrounding 9-11. And although many Americans do believe there was a conspiracy—and a big one—behind the murder of President

Kennedy, the nature of the Israeli connection to the Kennedy assassination still remains largely hidden. Most people find it easier to believe that Lyndon Johnson was behind the conspiracy or simply that "the CIA did it" or that "the Mafia Killed JFK." Or that "the military-industrial complex" was the force behind the JFK assassination and, later, behind the 9-11 attacks.

But what we do know, beyond question, is that Israel did carry out that treacherous attack on the *Liberty*.

We are told by the mass media to "support the troops" in Iraq and Afghanistan and to rally behind the troops if we go to war against Iran, but that same media refuses to support the troops who were aboard the *USS Liberty* and who insist, to this day, that the attack was deliberate; that the Israelis knew that the *Liberty* was an American ship.

Americans, by and large, do support our troops and admire our military and if more and more Americans learn what happened to those troops on the *USS Liberty*, just the simple fact that Israel attacked the *Liberty* and knew that it was an American ship, it would lead to a major revolution in American attitudes toward Israel.

To their credit there have been some former high-ranking military figures—ranging from Admiral Thomas Moorer, longtime chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to my friend, the late Colonel Donn Grand Pre—along with an eminent host of independent journalists such as Peter Hounam and Jim Taylor and my friends Mark Glenn and Mark Dankof and Tito Howard (among so many others) who have worked relentlessly to bring the truth to the American people.

There are no complex theories involved surrounding the attack on the *Liberty*. Americans have been distracted and mis-directed by many of the theories surrounding the JFK assassination (how many assassins were involved, where the shots came from, how many bullets were fired) and by many theories surrounding the 9-11 attacks (for example: how the World Trade Center was brought down, whether there were actually hijackers on the planes, etc). In many respects, I suspect, much of that mis-direction, is deliberate, designed to confuse the matters even further.

But it is not so complicated when one discusses the attack on the *Liberty*. The fact is that Israeli warplanes and torpedo boats deliberately and without provocation tried to sink an American ship and kill all of the men on board for the very simple reason that they wanted the crime to be blamed on the Arabs and thereby provoke a nuclear attack on the Arab world and give Israel the opportunity reign supreme in the Middle East.

It's that simple.

That's why the *USS Liberty* is so important: not only for the men of the *Liberty* to finally see justice but—even more critically—so that we can turn American foreign policy around, before it's too late.

CHAPTER TWELVE

The Amazing, Silly and Nonsensical Efforts To Excuse Israeli Crimes and the Intrigues of the Jewish Lobby in America

Over the years, as a critic of Israel, I have been amazed—time and again—how otherwise intelligent people would be rendered absolutely useless intellectually when confronted with cold, hard facts about Israel and its misdeeds (and the word "misdeeds" is a rather mild way of describing Israel's outrageous behavior).

On one occasion, on my nightly radio broadcast on the Republic Broadcasting Network, I reflected on this pathetic phenomenon and actually gave my listeners a run-down on some of the rather bizarre responses I had received from friends and associates when I had pointed out some of Israel's crimes and provocations.

Here are some actual statements of fact regarding Israel that I made and actual excuses made on behalf of Israel that I received in response. They are certainly worth recounting. You'll be alternately amused and horrified by some of the idiotic and nonsensical responses—and every single one of these responses is rendered precisely as I heard it . . .

FACT: Israeli forces deliberately attacked the U.S.S. *Liberty* and murdered 34 Americans and wounded 171 others . . .

EXCUSE: Well, you know, the Jews are God's Chosen People . . .

FACT: Israeli intelligence knew in advance there were going to be the terrorist attacks on September 11 and never warned America . . .

EXCUSE: Well, the Jewish people really suffered during the Holocaust . . .

FACT: Israel staged terrorist attacks on U.S. installations in Egypt during the 1950s and tried to blame those terrorist attacks on Muslim extremists . . .

EXCUSE: When I was at Penn State, I had a room-mate who was Jewish and I get a Christmas card from her every year . . .

FACT: The Israelis have defied all international nuclear arms treaties and continue to build nuclear weapons, causing Saddam Hussein and other Arab nations to seek nuclear arms . . .

EXCUSE: I have a Jewish doctor and he and his wife are wonderful people. They've come to our home for dinner on several occasions. If you'd meet them, you'd see what nice people they are ...

FACT: Israeli intelligence plays a major role in the international drug trade, bringing heroin and cocaine into the United States ...

EXCUSE: Some of my clients are Jewish people ...

FACT: Israel has a policy of torturing political prisoners ...

EXCUSE: A lot of fine doctors and scientists and actors and writers and musicians are Jewish ...

FACT: Israel is a major player in the worldwide trafficking of women for use as sex slaves and in prostitution ...

EXCUSE: Well, you know, Empire Kosher Poultry is owned by Jewish people and they've provided a lot of jobs for people in Central Pennsylvania ...

FACT: Judaism teaches hatred for all non-Jews ...

EXCUSE: A nice Jewish couple used to own Schott's Department Store here in town. They were very friendly to Christians.

These were actual responses—excuses—that came from the mouths of otherwise intelligent human beings. But they certainly reflected the brainwashing that had been imposed upon them by the Zionist-controlled media in America. What madness!

Why is the media covering up the fact that the Jewish religion teaches that Jesus Christ is now in Hell boiling in his own body fluids?

If that's not "hatred," then I don't know what is!

If we're going to declare war on Islam for "hating Christianity" (which it doesn't, by the way), then we sure as Hell had better declare war on Judaism!

That's right. Let 'er rip!

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Confronting Big Shot Politicians in Washington Over the Issue of Israeli Crimes & Jewish Intrigues

Now, at this juncture, as one famous American politician used to say: Let me make one thing perfectly clear: I don't buy the idea that American politicians are gods, people who—as some say—"must" be respected and treated with dignity "because they represent us in Washington"—or Harrisburg or Sacramento or wherever. No, these politicians are our paid public servants—or rather they are supposed to be "public" servants—and they are supposed to be answerable to the American people. And, of course, the fact is that these politicians often disregard American interests precisely because they are at the beck and call of the Jewish lobby.

It is rare that a politician will ignore the demands of the Jewish money interests and their well-heeled political action committees in favor of the general interests of the people at large. Money talks. It is as simple as that, and that constitutes a core of the Jewish problem in the American political arena. Jews have an immense amount of money at their disposal and do not hesitate to use it to advance their own political, religious and ideological agenda.

In any event, on a number of occasions over the years, living on Capitol Hill in Washington, when I had the opportunity to confront a number of American politicians for their subservience to Israel, I took those opportunities with relish. The politicians whom I victimized, so to speak, no doubt remembered those confrontations—perhaps as unexpected as they were—for a long time after.

Yes, I've had a little bit of experience taking on some of the bigshot politicians on their own turf, talking to them in ways that I am relatively sure that few others have.

The first such incident took place at Roland's, a well-known Capitol Hill grocery store on the corner of Fourth Street and Independence Avenue, SE. At Roland's, I often had occasion to see politicians various and sundry.

One of those in question happened to be Sen. Paul Simon (D-ILL.) who had been elected to the Senate with overwhelming Jewish support from across the country in defeating for reelection Sen. Charles Percy, a liberal Republican, who had been targeted by the Jewish lobby for his relatively mild criticisms of Israeli policy toward the Palestinians.

Senator Simon and I happened to be standing in line at the grocery store as I was buying *The Washington Post* which featured a headline relating to some Israeli atrocity in Lebanon. I laid the newspaper on the counter and speaking to the clerk—a Pakistani Muslim with whom I had

had previously had a number of lively conversations about Zionism—I said, “Look at this. These damned Israelis will never stop. But the only reason they get away with it,” I added, turning and staring down at Senator Simon, who stood about a head shorter than me, “is because all of these criminals over in Congress let them get away with it.” The clerk nodded his agreement and laughed, probably not recognizing his distinguished customer standing next to me whom I was staring straight in the eye. The senator looked perturbed.

But it was only years later that I discovered another reason why the senator probably was indeed perturbed. In a chance conversation with a Washington cabdriver—another Pakistani Muslim—the cabdriver mentioned to me (in a discussion of Jewish power on Capitol Hill) that he had once had Senator Simon as a passenger in his cab.

He asked the senator why he had declined to run for reelection and Simon told him, “You want to know the real reason. I’ll tell you why. It’s because of the Israeli lobby. I was always a firm friend of Israel and I was elected with strong Jewish support. But after I got elected to the Senate, I found that they simply wouldn’t let up. They were always coming to me and essentially demanding that I do things that they wanted done. And I just got tired of it.”

So perhaps—just maybe—that little incident at Roland’s grocery store remained in the senator’s mind. I’d like to think that it did. Even by that time, I would guess, Senator Simon—always hailed as a man of integrity (and now I do believe he was)—had probably had his fill of his erstwhile friends in the Jewish lobby.

On another occasion, right out in front of, again, Roland’s Grocery I saw none other than Sen. Bob Kerry (D-Mass.) who, many years later, became the Democratic presidential nominee in 2004. The senator was getting out of a convertible sports car and I said, “Hello, Senator Kerry. How much longer are you and the rest of Congress going to continue to do the bidding of the Jewish lobby?”

Kerry was surprised, needless to say, but he did a dramatic double-take and attempted to feign “shock” at my question, perhaps perceiving that this was the “required” response, especially, of course, in case there were any hotshot Jewish campaign contributors standing nearby! He said nothing and I saluted and went on my merry way. (Later I learned that Kerry himself is of partial Jewish extraction.)

On yet a third occasion, yes, right outside Roland’s Grocery, I encountered Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), a Jewish devotee of Israel. Ironically, I had just returned from a giant protest meeting outside the Washington Hilton Hotel where the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the lobby for Israel, had been holding its annual meeting.

At the protest, a friend of mine and I had attracted quite a bit of attention as my friend, a tall, lanky African-American, was holding high above the crowd (in a box labeled “Ariel Sharon”) a stuffed boar’s head which had adorned the wall of my office at the Liberty Lobby headquarters on Capitol Hill. The boar’s head had amused many of the anti-AIPAC protesters, particularly since many of them were Muslims and, as you know, boars—pigs—are considered unclean by both Muslims and Jews alike. So having given the boar the moniker of the then-Israeli Prime Minister was a particularly vicious double-whammy.

In any case, you guessed it, I just happened to have the boar’s head with me and as I passed by Senator Levin, I held it up and said, “Hello Senator Levin. Here’s Ariel Sharon.” He looked at the boar’s head and then nodded his own head, as if to say, “Yeah, yeah, I get your anti-Semitic rub, you Goy bastard!” And he moved on. Standing nearby was Reid, the popular attendant at the Capitol Hill Exxon. “You’re bad. You’re bad,” he said, shaking his head and laughing.

Another “project,” so to speak, involved Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York, long known as a strident and aggressive voice on behalf of Zionist Imperialism and Jewish interests during his DIS-service as so-called “American” Ambassador to the United Nations and later in the Senate, during which he sounded more like “The Senator From Tel Aviv” than the Senator from New York.

Moynihan’s dressing down took place outside the rear entrance to his penthouse apartment at elegant Market Square in downtown Washington. As a friend of mine was driving me past the building, I spotted Moynihan coming down the street. He seemed to be walking upright, which was remarkable, since Moynihan often showed up drunk on the Senate floor—a fact well known in official Washington. I assumed that he was relatively sober at this time.

Seizing the opportunity and without explaining why, I directed my driver to “pull over. Right now.” My driver, Gregory Garnett—the same African-American lad who had hoisted the boar’s head at the AIPAC rally, by the way—was a bit surprised at the urgency of my tone and he did so, soon realizing what was afoot.

Leaning out the car window I addressed the senator who was walking hardly more than ten feet away: “Senator Moynihan!”

The senator stopped, turned and proceeded to tip his hat.

“I’m an Irishman—” I said, at which Moynihan smiled—but then I proceeded to strip the senator bare, telling him in sharp, but measured, tones: “However, Senator, I consider you a traitor to the Irish people. You are a long time shill for the Israelis. You are a Zionist warmonger, sir. I hold you responsible for the troubles that are facing the United States in

the Middle East and for what happened in New York on September 11. You should be ashamed of yourself, living safely here in Washington while your fellow New Yorkers died."

Moynihan's jaw fell.

As a "public servant" he felt he was beyond any form of criticism, never expecting that someone would dare to publicly upbraid him for his criminal betrayal of America's interests. Moynihan was not accustomed to having anybody ever speak to him in less than fawning tones, so it came as a particular shock that a well-dressed, and clearly intelligent and articulate American was giving him a public whipping.

Standing nearby, a young Black woman, dressed quite professionally, overheard the whipping of the senator and nodded at me, smiling, and saying, "You've got it right." Passing also was a young African-American male who gave me thumbs up saying, "Give 'em Hell!"

The senator proceeded to scamper away as we pulled away. I was chuckling, frankly, and my driver remarked with a grin, "The poor old man grabbed his heart," and I responded, "Good," and then declared bombastically (but sincerely): "He needs to feel the pain that thousands of innocent Christian and Muslim Palestinian men, women and children have felt the last 50 years. Maybe he will learn something. That's why life is all about: learning." (I explained to my driver the context of my remarks, referring to Israel's mistreatment of the Palestinians.)

Ironically, I told my driver, Moynihan had been a longtime friend of the Kennedy family. I went on, saying, "The truth is that the Kennedys hated Jews and had none in their inner circle. They only allowed a few Jewish hangers on. So Moynihan knows better. That's why his betrayal of his heritage is so shocking. He knows who did in the Kennedy brothers and he energetically serves the Jews in the most slavish fashion."

For all intents and purposes, I had given the old lush an intellectual version of the tried-and-true Israeli strip-and-whip torture treatment—the same kind of treatment that Moynihan endorsed the Israelis levelling against Arab men, women and children for years.

I stripped the old fool down bare and exposed him for the big fat floppy drunken phony that he was—nothing but a buffoonish clown who spent the last half of his life shilling for the Jews and the state of Israel—and making a pretty penny doing it.

As I told another friend, reflecting upon this amusing event: "We've got to take these politicians to task for selling out to the Jews. If we strip 'em and whip 'em good and hard, maybe the politicians will start looking out for the people. The politicians think we're afraid of them, but we're not. We've got to cut them down to size and let them have it. Otherwise they'll continue to shill for the Jews just like Pat Moynihan."

To hand-wringers and limp-wrists who were shocked to hear how I had addressed the senator, I noted that I did nothing illegal, made no threats, and spoke to Moynihan in a normal tone of voice. There were no implied threats. "It's called the First Amendment," I reminded them. However, I know Moynihan's Jewish masters would have liked to put an end to that, too. They didn't want Americans to be able to object to their misdeeds or to chasten their pet terriers like Moynihan.

Incidentally, it's probably worth nothing, in reference to the Kennedy family and the Jews, a story that was told to me by my late friend, veteran journalist William J. Gill.

A very-well-connected American of Irish extraction, Gill had been a good friend of a well-known Irish American labor union leader in Pennsylvania who was, in turn, a close personal and political associate of the Kennedy family. For several years in the mid-1960s, the labor leader had continually said to Gill—a hard-line traditional conservative who frankly hated the Kennedys because of their liberalism—that he would dearly love to get Gill together with Bobby Kennedy.

"Bill, you and Bobby would hit it off big-time," the labor leader told Gill. "Bobby hates the Jews as much as you do. In fact," he said, "anytime we're out in public, in a restaurant or whatever, and Bobby is talking about the Jews, he refers to them as 'the liberals.'" In retrospect, Gill told me with a laugh, "Maybe the Kennedys weren't so bad after all."

True story. Not something that the Kennedy family would like memorialized, but very true.

The collective point of this assembly of anecdotes relating to my various encounters with politicians is that, given the opportunity, I've exercised every chance I've had to openly and candidly and discuss controversial issues not just in letters to the editor and in newspaper articles and on radio broadcasts, but directly with the politicians who have been responsible for some of the disastrous and tragic policies that I have so loudly objected to.

The lesson to be learned for all Americans from my own experiences described here is that we should have no fear of OUR public servants. They are responsible to us. If they are not, we will use all means at our disposal to make them responsible to us.

Otherwise the politicians can expect the American people—in the end—to rise up in their righteous might and set things straight. And that is the way it should be.

No single special interest group—no matter how powerful or wealthy—should have the right to determine America's future, even if that special interest group perceives itself to be "God's Chosen People."

America's Generals Speak Out . . .

Although many have written and spoken about Jewish power in our world today, those who understand it best are those non-Jews who move in the higher circles. Among them have been respected American military leaders whose views on these matters have been hidden from the American public. In that regard we refer to the remarkable 2000 book, *The Jewish Threat: Anti-Semitic Politics of the U.S. Army* by Joseph W. Bendersky. Some relevant quotations from the book follow:

General George V. Strong, Chief of Military Intelligence (1942-1945) was the most powerful intelligence figure in Washington and an influential opponent of opening Palestine to Jewish refugees. Strong even attempted to get the secretaries of state and war to prevent meetings and demonstrations by American Jews on the Palestine issue.

Between the 1930s and 1980s [General Albert C.] Wedemeyer believed that Jews constituted a serious threat to America's national interests. His "Top Secret" reports in 1948 strongly opposed the creation of Israel as endangering national security and condemned an insidious Jewish manipulation of the American government and public.

Generals Charles A. Willoughby, Edward M. Almond, [General Douglas MacArthur's top commanders] belonged to the clique of retired prominent generals known as the "Secret Americans" struggling against alleged insidious Jewish forces undermining America and the West. . . . Stratemeyer became a prominent promoter of Jewish conspiracy theories in the 1950s.

Marine Corps General Pedro del Valle believed that an "invisible government" of international Jews controlled America and worked in conjunction with their co-conspirators in Russia. As late as 1962 he still emphasized the significance of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

General George S. Patton, Jr. believed that Jews were conspiring to undermine him and implement Communism in Europe. [For more on the little-known story of Patton's struggle with the Jews after World War II, see Ladislav Farago's 1981 book, *The Last Days of Patton*—MCP]

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

What One of the World's Richest and Most Powerful Individuals Told Me About the Reality of Jewish Power . . .

It is one thing to read and write about Jewish power but it is another thing altogether to experience it, at its highest levels, first hand. While, in my own limited career in the public arena, I have tangled with Jewish agitators—representatives of such anti-American (really, anti-human) outfits as the Anti-Defamation League and the Simon Wiesenthal Center, among others—the truth is that there have been powerful public figures (politicians among them first and foremost) who have dealt directly with the intrigues of the international Jewish elite. In 1987 I heard—in person—from one of the most famous people on the planet her own description of the impact of Jewish power on her own considerable power. Here's the story . . .

This story, in some respects, will come as a shock to those who prefer to worship the myth that Jews are no more influential politically and financially than other groups on our planet today. However, this is first-hand testimony as related to me by someone who truly knew the score.

In the late 1980s, the weekly populist newspaper for which I was a correspondent, *The Spotlight*, featured a series of disturbing articles detailing how the international plutocratic interests—working through the Reagan administration and the CIA (and Israel's Mossad)—were working to dislodge Ferdinand Marcos as ruler of the Philippines. The reason was that Marcos was refusing to knuckle under to the plutocratic elite, refusing to allow his national policies to be dictated by the powers-that-be. In addition, Marcos was in control of a massive gold treasure that these interests wanted for themselves.

In fact, as *The Spotlight* reported, Marcos' vast personal wealth was as a consequence of his having procured a substantial portion of a gold hoard accumulated by the Japanese during World War II, as the Japanese looted the Asian nations that they conquered. In short, Marcos' wealth did not come—contrary to reports by the Jewish-controlled "mainstream" media—from embezzling money from his nation's treasury or from U.S. foreign aid to the Philippines.

As it was, Ferdinand Marcos became aware of the truthful reportage by *The Spotlight* and its chief correspondent, the inimitable and unrivaled Andrew St. George, and later invited St. George to visit with him at the Marcos family home in exile in Hawaii.

Not only did Andrew have the pleasure of spending time with the Marcos family at their villa in Honolulu, but our publisher, Willis Carto, and I myself—on other occasions—did likewise.

In fact, I spent an entire very memorable day at the Marcos home, mostly in the company of Imelda, who is quite the charmer and who was justly known as "the most beautiful woman in Asia." And although the president was quite busy, he took time off to stop by for a few minutes and said, quite pointedly, "Thank you for all of the good work that *The Spotlight* is doing. We have appreciated it very much."

And it was for good reason that Imelda told me—in utmost candor but quite casually and with some reflection—that "As long as we were in good standing with the Jewish people in New York, everything went well for us. But when they turned against us, everything fell apart."

This is *exactly* what she said to me that day in April of 1987 as we sat on her veranda overlooking the Pacific sharing a box of chocolates.

And I can tell you that although I certainly knew of the immense power of international Jewry, her comment sent chills down my spine.

Here was one of the wealthiest and most powerful people on the face of the planet telling me in no uncertain terms that it was—well—the Jews, who had brought about the demise of the Marcos regime.

When Imelda referred to "the Jewish people in New York," she didn't mean the diamond district rabbis, or the Fifth Avenue furriers, or the Orthodox butchers in Brooklyn or the pawnbrokers in Harlem. No, she meant the international banking houses of the Rothschild Empire.

And it should be pointed out—in light of the ongoing financial scandal that is creating such havoc in the American system—that *The Spotlight* specifically named Maurice "Hank" Greenberg, the now-infamous figure behind the AIG insurance giant, as one of the key behind-the-scenes players in the conspiracy to destroy the Marcos family.

And it likewise is no coincidence that Zionist hard-liner Paul Wolfowitz, who later rose to fame as one of the "neo-conservatives" in the George W. Bush administration, pushing for the war against Iraq, was also one of those acting against Ferdinand and Imelda Marcos.

One final note about Mrs. Marcos and her famous "shoe collection." Contrary to the lies of the Zionist-controlled media, the fact is that most of the many thousands of shoes held in her famous closets at Malacanang Palace in Manila had actually been gifts to her from the Philippine shoe industry. She told me this herself.

It seems that virtually every time one of the shoe companies brought out a new line, they would send the First Lady samples in every color. Many of the shoes didn't even fit! But it would have been unseemly, of course, for the First Lady of the republic to be discovered dumping the shoes in the palace trash, so consequently they were put away—only to be discovered when the palace was over-run after the CIA- and Mossad-directed *coup d'état* that forced the Marcos family into exile and




During his visit with former Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos and his wife Imelda in exile in Hawaii, Michael Collins Piper learned from Mrs. Marcos that the CIA station chief in Manila had tried to trick the Marcos into allowing their grandchildren to leave the Marcos palace when it was under siege. Mrs. Marcos refused to allow the children to depart, for she was convinced that when the children left that the CIA would have given the signal for the assassination of her and the president. These are just some of the realities of global affairs that only highly-placed people such as the Marcos can fully understand.

made into a sensational cause celebre by the worldwide media, which used as "evidence" the claim that somehow the Marcos's had embezzled billions from their nation's treasury, when nothing, as we have seen, could be further from the truth.

And just for the record, the day I visited Imelda she laughingly pointed out to me that she was wearing a \$10 pair of sandals she had purchased at a chain discount store.

So although Imelda's now-legendary shoe collection was well known to every man, woman and child who opened a newspaper or a magazine everywhere across the globe, the subject of countless comic monologues on television and caricatured in cartoons for weeks on end, hundreds of millions of people all over the world knew absolutely nothing about the vast gold treasure that was the real source of their wealth.

Thus, utilizing lies and disinformation, the American media made villains of the Marcos family just as they have made villains of so many others who have stood up to the Jewish elite, in one form or another, for the past century. It is a fact of political life that cannot be denied, any more than one can deny the preeminent role of Jewish influence in the mass media—and in our world—today.



Shown above is a reproduction of a display that Michael Collins Piper prepared for the February 23, 1998 issue of *The Spotlight* (a copy of which was later privately given to Bill and Hillary Clinton, as described in the chapter which follows). At left is a photograph of the back of President Bill Clinton taken at a White House reception in November 1996. This photo was published in *The Washington Post* on January 29, 1998. Over the president's left shoulder is Monica Lewinsky who was at the center of the sex-and-perjury scandal that had engulfed the president. This photo, one of a series taken at the time, was made at the same time a soon-to-be-infamous (but never publicly-seen) video of the president, hugging Lewinsky (shown repeatedly on television) was made by the White House staff. These images both feature a rare "rear view" of Clinton. Although *The Spotlight* had hundreds of press photos of Clinton in its file, not a single view of the president taken from this position could be found. At the right is part of an advertisement attacking Clinton and accusing him of having "turned his back" on Israel. This ad appeared in *Washington Jewish Week's* (Thursday) January 15 edition which came out six days before the first news of the Lewinsky scandal began breaking at midnight on Tuesday, January 20. There is little doubt that the ad utilizes a view of Clinton that was excised from one of the pictures taken of the president during the November 1996 receiving line where he was photographed and videotaped hugging Lewinsky. It is known that before the scandal broke on January 20 that Lewinsky had been discussing the fact that there was a photographic record of this event. So the question *The Spotlight* raised was this: How did the hard-line "right wing" Israeli critics of Clinton (and their supporters in the United States) just happen to come across this particular image of Clinton for use in their advertising campaign which clearly was laid out well in advance of the eruption of the scandal. The advertisement was sponsored by a group calling itself "the Committee for a Secure Peace" and reflected the views of the forces surrounding neo-conservative publicist William Kristol who was the first journalist to have publicly mentioned that there was an impending scandal involving the president and a White House intern. It is no wonder that President Clinton and First Lady Hillary Clinton privately admitted to a friend that they believed that *The Spotlight's* expose was very much on target and that it was indeed the "right wing" supporters of Israel who were responsible for generating the Lewinsky scandal.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

Bill and Hillary Dare to Speak Out (Although Privately)

Considering the fact that Ferdinand Marcos and Imelda were one of the great "power couples" of the 20th Century, it's probably appropriate to memorialize here (for the record) my own indirect experience with one of the other great power couples—Bill and Hillary Clinton—as it relates directly to the same topic: Jewish power.

My "encounter" (as it were) with the Clintons came about at precisely the time when the infamous Monica Lewinsky scandal was raising havoc with the Clinton administration. Needless to say, I was watching the story closely.

The direct consequence of it all was that, in the end, I had the satisfaction of knowing that Bill and Hillary Clinton personally agreed with me (and what I had written about the topic).

Bill and Hillary are not likely to acknowledge the factual foundation of this story, but then, again, I understand why. They are still both very much in the forefront of the global political arena and still very much reliant upon a large degree of Jewish influence (and money) to advance their own personal agendas. In any event, here is the story . . .

The record shows that at least six days before the first news of the Lewinsky scandal began breaking in the broadcast media at midnight on Tuesday, January 20, 1998, an advertisement appeared in the January 15 edition of the respected *Washington Jewish Week* newspaper accusing President Clinton of having "turned his back on Israel."

What made the advertisement so striking was that it used a rear view of President Clinton (first captured on video in 1996) that had never been published but which, in the wake of the Lewinsky scandal, became very familiar. It was a view of the president, his back to the camera, clearly taken from the video in which he was seen hugging the soon-to-be infamous Miss Lewinsky when she was in a receiving line at the White House some two years before. Miss Lewinsky had known of the existence of this video and bragged about it among her associates prior to the time that the scandal broke.

So clearly, Clinton's critics among the pro-Netanyahu forces in the United States—who sponsored the advertisement—were already aware of the fact of the Lewinsky-Clinton liaison and, more significantly, of the fact that it was soon to be unleashed upon the president.

That it was one of Netanyahu's key American partisans, the aforementioned William Kristol, who was first to announce the impending scandal is clearly no coincidence.

At the time, I published the story of the evidence of the Likudnik role in the Lewinsky scandal in the February 2, 1998 issue of *The Spotlight* newspaper, reproducing the "rear view" of Clinton from the videotape (as published in newspapers all across the United States) side-by-side with the same rear image as utilized in the Likudnik propaganda campaign against the president.

This *Spotlight* story came as a follow-up to an earlier story by this author in that newspaper's issue of February 9, 1998, outlining other previous indications of Israeli-Likudnik orchestration of the scandal.

Shortly after the publication of these stories that critics labeled as "conspiracy mongering," a friend of the author—who also just happened to be an old Arkansas political friend of President and Mrs. Clinton—passed on the *Spotlight* stories to persons whom he described as "my friends" and then—after those friends reviewed the material—told the author: "I think you're right. And my friends think you're right. But we've never had this conversation."

And in case you haven't figured it out, those "friends" who saw my writings and concurred with them were . . . Bill and Hillary Clinton.

It's probably appropriate to mention, too, that during the Lewinsky affair I ran into the Clintons' old friend, James Carville, who was one of my neighbors on Capitol Hill. There was nobody nearby so I felt comfortable in making a few remarks out of the carshot of the press. "Mr. Carville," I bellowed, hailing the man, who turned, smiling. I then declared: "Everybody knows that the right wing in Israel and its allies in this country are promoting the Lewinsky affair and the impeachment of the president. You know it and I know it."

Carville looked around to make sure no one was listening and then he giggled. He was clearly startled that someone had said such a thing publicly. I continued: "Why isn't anybody saying this? Why aren't Bill and Hillary standing up to the Israelis and bringing this into the public arena?" And Carville giggled again. But he wouldn't comment, for obvious reasons. He simply continued to giggle and I dismissed him with a wave of my hand, shaking my head as he scurried away.

Imagine it: James Carville—Mr. Motormouth—speechless for the first time in history. Now anyone who knows Carville from television knows he is one who is ready to argue and relishes it. But he wouldn't argue. He knew the facts were right on the mark.

And so it was that several weeks later I learned that at precisely the time I had met Carville he was actually preparing to go to Israel to fight the forces opposing Israel's right-wing prime minister, Binyamin Netanyahu, on behalf of Bill and Hillary Clinton. No wonder my remarks unnerved him so. I had hit too close to home!

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Today's Russia and the Jewish Problem: An "American Nationalist Anti-Semite" Gets a "Big Hello" in Moscow

To be perfectly honest, as an old-fashioned anti-communist out of the Cold War (not having known any better, in retrospect, I suppose), I never had any desire to visit Russia. But in January of 2002—well after the collapse of the Soviet regime—I was invited to come to Russia.

And I must say that I left that country with a full understanding of what the character in the film, *The Russia House*, played by the inimitable Sean Connery—portraying a British expatriate long ensconced in Russia—meant when he declared with fervor: "I love Russia."

That trip to Russia was remarkable, to say the very least, and considering the fact that Moscow was once the global capital of the Jewish Communist Internationale, the experience was one that will live with me to my dying days. And it ended, as you'll see, on a particularly interesting note . . .

On that visit to Russia I had the distinct honor—and unique opportunity—of being one of a handful of Americans to address some 200 people who convened in Moscow for the First International Conference on Global Problems of World History.

The conference was co-sponsored by the Moscow-based Encyclopedia of Russian Civilization, chaired by Dr. Oleg Platonov—one of Russia's most distinguished nationalist theoreticians—and by the Washington, D.C.-based bimonthly journal of nationalist thought and history, *The Barnes Review*, of which I was one of the founding editors.

Quite an assembly it was: among the speakers with whom I was privileged to share the platform were some of Russia's most highly regarded intellectuals, along with a host of others representing nations from Bulgaria to Serbia to Austria to Switzerland and beyond to Morocco and even Australia. My longtime friends, Dr. Fredrick Toben of the Adelaide Institute, famed American political maverick, Dr. David Duke, and revisionist scholar, Juergen Graf, a good and decent man—a Swiss national who had been forced into exile after being convicted of "Holocaust Denial" in his native land—were among those on hand.

Scholars and gentlemen all—learned academics and researchers who dared to stand up and speak out on hotly controversial political topics—even including the long-hidden ethnic origins of Bolshevism—in a global capital in which terror once ruled the day, just a few miles from the site of the dreaded Lubyanka prison where dissidents were tortured and murdered for doing precisely what we were doing in Moscow

that winter weekend. And I should note this: the conference was held on the campus of the Humanitarian Social Academy—the school where, for generations, Russia's long-ruling Communist Party elite sent their children for training and indoctrination.

Imagine what a remarkable experience that was, and honestly chilling, quite frankly, to consider what others before me—standing in perhaps the same place, speaking out—had suffered as a consequence.

Never will I forget that moment when those assembled remained in silence for a full minute—a very long and highly emotional minute—prayerfully, and yes, tearfully—remembering and honoring the victims of the Bolshevik monsters who tried, but failed, to destroy the spirit of Russia and her people. Scholars, scientists, academicians and a few simple wordsmiths such as myself gathered together to stand in united opposition to “Globalism”—an age-old term that refers to the Jewish would-be construct for world supremacy: the New World Order.

Concluding the conference, the assembled delegates unanimously and enthusiastically approved a resolution—drafted by famed Russian international legal scholar Mikhail Kouznetsov—identifying Zionism and Talmudic Judaism as the driving force behind Globalism, urging worldwide unity among peoples in opposition to this insidious cancer.

In the end, we all convened for a wonderful banquet of great fellowship—hands across the water. There, many of us stood up and gave energetic toasts. Here was the precise wording of my toast on January 27, 2002, as I wrote it down and passed on to my friend, that titanic revisionist historian, Juergen Graf, for translation into Russian:

During the 20th century, Jewish plutocrats, Jewish communists, Jewish arms dealers and Jewish war-mongers divided the peoples of Russia and America and Germany and Britain—the entirety of civilization—unleashing a devastating global conflagration in which tens of millions died.

During the 21st century, let the Russian people join with the American people and all of the West and together hold out our hands to the peoples of Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America and with them stand united against those satanic monsters who created such misery for us all.

Let the 21st century bring an end to Jewish tyranny!

And I must tell you my toast was greeted with an energetic roar, particularly from the dynamic Boris Mironov, former press secretary to ex-Russian President Boris Yeltsin, with whom he had broken. I was delighted by his energetic “Da!” (that is, “Yes!”) in response to my toast.

After the conference I journeyed to downtown Moscow where I settled in for several days at the Hotel Moscow, once the hotel where visiting Communist Party functionaries from across Russia and around the world stayed when visiting the Soviet capital. The grand old hotel was near Red Square where I visited the tomb of Lenin—a remarkable memory for me for all time.

And I cannot help but recall when I came across an old lady selling books near Red Square—including a Russian translation of Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, which I secured as a souvenir. I had met the very nice lady at our conference and we recognized one another and exchanged friendly smiles and greetings, although neither of us spoke the other's language. Several folks—Russians—were speaking with the lady as she and I had exchanged our regards and they were looking over their shoulder at me, eyeing me somewhat suspiciously.

But I heard the lady, speaking in Russian (of course) to her friends, evidently explaining who this burly American was. And then she used the phrase, referring to me, smiling at me as she spoke, describing me, reverting to English, as an “American nationalist anti-Semite.”

At that instant the faces of her friends exploded in bright smiles and several of them came over to me, shaking hands and saying, in English, “Welcome to Russia.”

What a moment!

When I returned from Russia I was accused by Jews of being a “Stalinist” and a “Russophile” when, for the previous twenty years they had been calling me a “Nazi” and an “anti-Communist extremist.”

Actually, my views hadn't changed at all.

I was still the same supporter of social justice and human rights and the critic of both Communism and Super Capitalism and Corporate Imperialism I had always been.

Now, not surprisingly, the war-mongering Jews were mad as Hell that I—and other free-thinkers from around the world—participated in an international peace and social justice conference in Moscow.

The Jewish Elite simply could not stand the thought of a phenomenal and ground-breaking international conference such as this taking place: like-minded peace advocates and patriots from all the face of the planet gathering under one roof.

It scared them.

And it should have.

People of all races, creeds and colors were reaching out and joining hands—united—against the International Money Power. We declared in no uncertain terms that we wanted to smash the would-be Jewish Imperium that is popularly known as the New World Order.

Many Americans have never heard of Abu Dhabi. Abu Dhabi is the chief province (and the capital) of the United Arab Emirates (UAE), the federal of seven small oil-rich sheikdoms at the southeastern tip of Saudi Arabia on the Persian Gulf. Hardly more than a small town even just 30 years ago, Abu Dhabi is now one of the most modern cities on the face of the planet. It's a remarkable sight to behold and in many ways it's quite reminiscent of our own San Diego in California!

A very popular ruler, Sheik Zayed, used Abu Dhabi's immense oil riches—which imperial Israel would love to claim for its own—to not only build a world showplace, but also to advance his nation's domestic economy, providing social services and educational opportunities for his people. Abu Dhabi and the UAE are also leading foreign aid donor to nations of the developing world, particularly in Africa, and key players in the affairs of the Arab world. In fact, it was the UAE that made the controversial suggestion that Saddam Hussein of Iraq step down in order to forestall the second American war against Iraq.

Although Abu Dhabi's culture is very conservative and adheres to the traditions of Islam, the nation is "wide open" to Western consumer goods and even to Western broadcast and print media and not hostile to America or Americans, contrary to the image that the American media monopoly might parlay. Although, of course, I would temper that by pointing out that the people of Abu Dhabi—as in the rest of the Arab world—do have (and rightly so) serious concerns about U.S. policy toward the Palestine problem and the Arab world in general.

Many Americans will be particularly interested to know that even in the Arab world there is knowledge of—and concern about—the power and intrigue of the privately-controlled U.S. Federal Reserve money monopoly. Following my lecture at the Zayed Center, one young researcher actually quoted a famous American study of the Federal Reserve and asked for my comments. I can't imagine being asked such a question by an American student.

This was an auspicious time for an American to travel to the Arab world, just days before George W. Bush launched the invasion of Iraq. But my reception was tremendous. It was the journey of a lifetime. From the highest-ranking diplomats and government officials to the taxi drivers, the people were warm and friendly. The Arab people take great pride in their hospitality, and, frankly, they are especially pleased to be able to play host to Americans whom they know are sympathetic to their cause.

The Arabs know that Americans who dare to speak out about the power of the Israeli lobby are subject to smear, boycott, harassment and intimidation, so they have a particular respect for those Americans who risk being subjected to the consequences. At no time did I sense any hostility from anyone anywhere. I felt quite comfortable.

The people I met with during my trip were delighted to learn that there is an independent media voice such as *American Free Press*, one which brings an "alternative" point of view to that which appears in the big media in America. They were very interested in sample copies of AFP and the special "mini" AFP that I brought along for their review. The Arabs are most conscious of the control of the big media by Zionist

financial influences and of the impact on the media by groups such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith. So they are pleased that there is an intelligent slice of free thought in America today.

During the time I was in the UAE, the American government issued a warning to Americans not to travel in that country due to possible "dangers of terrorism." Many people asked me if I was afraid to be there. Actually, not at all. In fact, the only threat of any definitive kind that I know that I faced while in Abu Dhabi came from the U.S. government—my own native country.

Following my presentation at the Zayed Center, some intellectual thug from the U.S. Embassy in Abu Dhabi called the Center and complained about my appearance there, demanding to know why they had invited somebody from that infamous American newspaper, *American Free Press*, to speak and express my opinions.

At the time, the Center laughed off the complaint, particularly since the Center itself had been subjected, in the past, to heavy-duty media smear campaigns orchestrated by the ADL and the Simon Wiesenthal Center. (But, as you'll see, that wasn't the end of the matter.)

So here's the point: I find it telling that the rulers of the United States—my country—who were on the verge of launching a brutal war against the Arab people of Iraq in the name of "fighting for democracy and freedom," yet an official of my own nation would dare tell my Arab hosts that they had no right to sponsor a speaker such as me.

This was not only an insult to the national sovereignty of my hosts, but it was also an affront to my First Amendment right—as an American—to speak out and exercise a liberty that American authorities were constantly saying was being violated by Saddam Hussein and other leaders of the Arab world.

Despite all the lip service by the American government to the concept of "freedom," that freedom seems to stop when criticism of Israel or U.S. policy toward Israel is concerned. What utter hypocrisy.

And consider this: you will recall that, earlier in these pages, I recounted my own mother's concern for my safety while in Abu Dhabi. In fact, the danger I faced was not from the native people, but from the very government that purports to represent me. And that's another reason we need a Second American Revolution—to free the people of the United States from the grip of these bastards.

(You'll forgive my lapse into vulgar Talmudic-style language, but that relatively innocuous term is probably the most gentle way to describe the criminals who control the nation that I love so much.)

Earlier I mentioned that the vile action by the U.S. Embassy was the only "definitive" threat that I faced while in Abu Dhabi, but, for the his-

torical record, I did have a strange experience while there which suggested to me that my hotel room had been entered, on at least two occasions. To go into the details (which I have outlined both publicly and privately on a number of occasions) would probably confuse the matter, but suffice it to say that I am fairly certain that my hotel room was illicitly entered and that I was subjected to a subtle threat. And I don't think it was from some "evil Muslim."

Pointing out the fact that the Israeli intelligence services have been known for their intrigues in Abu Dhabi (not to mention elsewhere in the Arab world), I will leave it up to the reader to guess whom I believe was responsible for what happened.

In any case, while in Abu Dhabi—which is a very international city, in the classic sense—I encountered people from all over the Arab world, not just residents of the UAE. So was able to get a good solid sampling of international opinion within the Arab world.

Although there are now and always have been, differences of opinion between various Arab leaders and Arab states, one finds one thing which, I think, is consistent in their point of view (both then and now, some eight years later): that is, that the "new" United States—as it ventured on a course of global imperialism—had proven to be a big disappointment to the people and leaders of the Arab world.

Despite the long-standing so-called "special relationship" between the U.S. and Israel, which Arab leaders have always had to contend with, they had still nonetheless worked to maintain good relations with the U.S. It's been a difficult balancing act for them, in many respects, and it's now proving even more thankless than ever in light of the immense anti-Arab and anti-Muslim bias in the American media.

Unfortunately, the Arab leaders now recognized that the growing strength of the hard-line "neoconservative" Zionist bloc within the Bush administration (exemplified by Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle) and within the ranks of the Republican Party itself—represented by the likes of pro-Israel publicists such as William Kristol and the well-funded "neo-conservative" circles that follow his lead—had a fundamental impact on restructuring the U.S. relationship with the Arab world in a way that leaves the Arab leaders, in particular, feeling most unsettled.

One high-ranking Arab leader with whom I spoke, Sheik Sultan, the deputy prime minister and second son of then-ruling Sheik Zayed, told me this: "After the Cold War came to an end, I expected the United States to emerge as a true world leader—but not as imperial power. I never expected the United States to begin acting as an imperial power. I have been shocked by what has happened."

I spent four hours alone with Sheik Sultan—the chairman of the

Zayed Centre—at his remarkable palace in Abu Dhabi and engaged in a lively give-and-take with the London-educated prince who very much made the point that he had always admired the United States.

However, he pointed out that the American media and U.S. government policy makers were now promoting the idea of a "clash of civilizations"—something that he never dreamed possible. Following the Cold War, he said, he believed that there was now a genuine opportunity for world cooperation. Instead, the Arab and Muslim world has now become the new "enemy"—a new foundation, a new excuse, for U.S. military adventurism abroad.

Many Arabs with whom I spoke—leaders, intellectuals and commoners alike—went out of their way to emphasize the great respect for Jesus Christ that is inherent in the Muslim faith, pointing out that, in reality, there is much more in common between Islam and Christianity than there is between Judaism and Christianity, the popular mythology of a "Judeo-Christian tradition," notwithstanding.

It is also important—vitally important—to note that the treatment of the Palestinians by the Israelis is a festering sore on the body politic of the Arab world.

Although, for example, the Arab people in Abu Dhabi and the UAE, are far removed—geographically—from the plight of the Palestinians, the sympathy for the Palestinians (and the corresponding disgust for Israel's policies toward them) is intense and heartfelt.

While the people of Abu Dhabi, for example, are thriving, living comfortably, enjoying a lifestyle that the average Palestinian victim of Israeli occupation could only dream of, the people of Abu Dhabi—like the rest of the Arab world—consider the Palestine problem to be a major affront to all Arabs, and rightly so.

Although the Arab states reach from the Atlantic to Asia, varying widely in terms of government, population, even in forms of cultural diversity, the Arabs look upon themselves as one people—however divided—and an attack on one group of Arab people is viewed as an attack on all Arabs.

It might be viewed as similar to the way Americans responded on Sept. 11. Although New York City, for a variety of reasons, has never been held in particularly high regard by many Americans, the entire nation rallied behind New York City and its people in the wake of that tragedy.

Contrary to what the major media in America would have us believe, neither the people—nor the leaders—of the Arab world hold the American people responsible for the crimes and misdeeds in policy making by those in the United States government, either in the current Bush regime or in previous regimes.

Be assured that when you see massive rallies in the Arab and Muslim world protesting U.S. policy toward Israel or attacking U.S. plans for invading Iraq, those angry voices and sometimes inflammatory signs are not meant as an affront to the American people—only to those elite masters of manipulation who are pulling the levers of power at the highest ranks of the United States government.

The Arabs, as a people, have no more disregard for the American people than do America's distant cousins in the nations of Europe where massive "anti-American" protests—that is protests against U.S. government policy—have become a regular phenomenon. Yet, as part of the campaign against the Arab world—promoting that so-called "clash of civilizations"—the American media would suggest that "they" (that is, the Arabs) "hate us" and "hate our way of life." Nothing could be further from the truth.

As my friend, Dr. Issa Nakhleh, a Christian (by the way) and the long-time voice of the Palestine Arab delegation at the United Nations, has said time and time again to Americans who cared to listen: "The Arabs are not your enemies. They are your friends."

And needless to say, there were quite a few people interested in my perspective on the tragic events of September 11, 2001.

First of all—and this will be no surprise—there doesn't seem to be any question in the mind of either most Arab leaders or grass-roots citizens that Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad, played an enormous role in the 9-11 affair. At the least, there's a general feeling that even if the 9-11 terrorists were genuine "Muslim fanatics," then they were certainly being monitored by Israel and that Israel did know of the impending attack and chose not to warn the United States.

As Sheik Sultan of Abu Dhabi put it in the course of our private meeting: "The crime of September 11 could not have come about without the support of a state apparatus. The militant training camps of Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda simply did not have the capacity to carry off a crime of this magnitude." The implication, of course, is that the 9-11 terrorists were assisted by others.

The answer to who the "others" might have been reaches in a number of directions. The most likely culprit, obviously, is Israeli intelligence. However, there is a very real feeling among many in the Arab world that Osama bin Laden is actually a veritable creation of the CIA and that his actions are even now being directed by the CIA and the Mossad or otherwise perhaps manipulated, for a purpose.

The same Arab leader, Sheik Sultan, who expressed the idea that others were using bin Laden commented "We all remember the *Liberty*," referring, of course, to the American ship that was deliberately and bru-

tally attacked in the Mediterranean by the Israelis on June 7, 1967, resulting in the deaths of 34 Americans and the wounding of 172 others.

The sheik pointed out that if the *Liberty* had been totally destroyed, as the Israelis certainly intended, this would have been used as a major provocation for a U.S. attack on Egypt and the Arab states which would have been blamed for Israel's crime. Only the dedicated efforts by the wounded men on the *Liberty's* crew saved the ship.

Otherwise, the United States would have become embroiled in the 1967 war on the side of Israel, fighting to avenge the deaths of American sailors who would have been wrongly believed to have been murdered by Arab attackers.

The Arab leader's point was that the Sept. 11 terrorist tragedy was of a similar nature to the tragedy that befell the *Liberty*. That, in his view, the Israelis were indeed behind 9-11 and that it was for the purpose of setting the stage for U.S. war against the Arab world.

And, indeed, that has been the consequence. We did see the Bush administration trying rhetorically, at least, to connect Iraq to the events of 9-11, despite the fact that there is simply no evidence whatsoever that Iraq played any role at all.

During my presentation at the Zayed Centre, I was asked directly as to whether I viewed bin Laden as a tool of the CIA.

Noting that this was, as I said, a "very complex" question, I pointed out that whether bin Laden was a knowing or un-knowing tool of the CIA and the Mossad—and there's much evidence to suggest that he was—the fact remains that U.S. policy toward the Arab and Muslim worlds would have ultimately caused the creation of a bin Laden-type character even if bin Laden himself had never existed.

As Sheik Sultan pointed out to me, quite notably, that "Here in the Middle East, we never knew bin Laden until after Sept. 11. We only heard of him, and he only gained great recognition, as a result of the publicity he received in the American media."

In other words, bin Laden was never of any consequence—he was a virtual unknown, with no significant following—until after Sept. 11. The Arab leaders clearly felt that there was much more to bin Laden than meets the eye. It was only after Sept. 11 that many people in what the American media calls "the Arab street," ever heard of bin Laden.

In fact, the popularity that bin Laden did have was largely because he was seen as a counterbalance to the power of Israel.

It is not—as the average American might think—because bin Laden's Islamic fundamentalism holds such a spell over the Arab world. If anything, bin Laden was a very real threat to the traditional Arab world as we have known it.

That might confuse the average American who perceived bin Laden to be a major player in the Arab world. The average American may find it hard to understand why Israel and the CIA might have an interest in building up a hard-line Islamic fundamentalist leader in the region.

The truth is, of course, that bin Laden was as certainly hostile to the ruling regimes in Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Egypt, Libya—and even Iraq—along with the other Arab states as he was to the United States. Despite that, thanks to the Jewish-controlled media, Americans wrongly perceived bin Laden to represent the attitude of the entire Arab world toward the United States and the West.

With that in mind, Arab leaders know full well that it has been a long-standing policy on the part of Israel to keep the Arab world destabilized—“Balkanized”—to put a European twist on the concept. Thus, bin Laden and his Al-Qaeda operations played a major part in fulfilling that geopolitical aim on the part of Israel and its American allies.

By keeping the Arab states off balance, this provides Israel the opportunity to continue to expand its influence, if not its very borders.

The concept of a “Greater Israel” is perceived as a very real aim on the part of the Israelis and the policies of the Bush administration are viewed in the Arab world as a mechanism working to bring that about.

What is “Greater Israel”? How does that concept apply to the current drive by the United States to launch a war against Iraq? Greater Israel is the age-old Zionist dream of establishing an Israel that reaches from the Nile to the Euphrates. Anyone who looks at a world atlas will see that an Israel stretching from the Nile to Euphrates reaches considerably beyond the borders of the state of Israel as we know it today, encompassing a major portion of the Arab world.

While we are constantly told by the American media that the Arabs want to overrun Israel and wipe it off the map, Americans do not know that the situation is quite the opposite: it is Israel that dreams of redrawing the map of the Middle East and eliminating the Arab states that we know today.

Anyone who thinks that “little Israel” is content with its current borders has a sad lack of knowledge or understanding of the ideology that drives Israel and its leadership. Hard-line Zionist fanatics, who now rule the roost both in Tel Aviv and Washington, see the war against Iraq as a first step toward dismantling the Arab states and expanding Israeli influence throughout the Middle East, fulfilling the dream of a Greater Israel.

Those Americans who are protesting the war against Iraq and saying that the war is “only about oil,” are missing a much bigger point, perhaps in an effort to avoid pointing a finger in the direction of Israel and thereby being accused of “anti-Semitism.”

While it is true that there is nothing that the multinational oil companies would love more than to be able to dislodge the Arab rulers and have control of the Arab world’s mineral natural resources, the truth is that, even the oil companies—with all of their considerable clout—could not enforce such a policy (using American military might) were it not for the willing collaboration of the Israeli lobby in America.

What this means—at the bottom line—is that if the ephemeral dream of a Greater Israel is ultimately fulfilled, in a more and quite literal “down-to-earth” sense—and this is critical, from a geopolitical standpoint—it will also be the first time in history that Zionism has effectively achieved control of a significant portion of the world’s oil supply. Never underestimate that crucial fact.

Although Zionist power in the media, in education, in culture has been spiraling to a degree in the United States unlike at any time in any nation in history, the control of oil has always been outside the hands of the Zionist power bloc.

And by sheer accident of history, it just so happens that the Arabs sit on the oil—at this time. That’s something that the Zionists hope to rectify. Make no mistake about it.

In my address to the Zayed Center, I pointed out that, writing in *Time* on Feb. 17, Charles Krauthammer—one of the most widely-touted pro-Zionist fanatics in the American media today—announced that the proposed war against Iraq “is not just to disarm Saddam. It is to reform a whole part of the world.”

“What the U.S. needs in the Arab world,” he said, “is not an exit strategy but an entry strategy. Iraq is the beckoning door . . .”

Krauthammer and his like-minded colleagues in the media and in the “neo-conservative” circles surrounding Richard Perle and others who were guiding the Bush administration’s Middle East policy are intent upon waging war on the entire Islamic world. Krauthammer frankly named their targets: “Iran, Saudi Arabia, Syria and beyond.”

Note those ominous words, I told my audience: “And beyond.” Those words mean a lot.

In that regard, I turned to the Prophet Muhammad, who once said that, “One learned man is harder on the devil than a thousand ignorant worshippers.” I told my Arab audience that Charles Krauthammer and those of his ilk do represent the devil and not until there is a truly free press in America will we be able to turn so many ignorant Americans into learned men.

26 Focus
SundayStar
A lot of people are deeply afraid of mentioning Israel in an argument — Michael Collins Piper

Upsetting the establishment

Author publishes and is damned

THROUGHOUT his career, Piper has been a controversial figure in the media, and his recent visit to Malaysia has been no exception. He is a "controversial" figure because he is an independent thinker, which is a rare quality in the 21st century. He is also a "controversial" figure because he is a Jew, which is a rare quality in the 21st century. He is also a "controversial" figure because he is a Jew, which is a rare quality in the 21st century. He is also a "controversial" figure because he is a Jew, which is a rare quality in the 21st century.




At the time of his visit to Malaysia, Piper was the only Jew to speak at the event. He was also the only Jew to be invited to speak at the event. He was also the only Jew to be invited to speak at the event. He was also the only Jew to be invited to speak at the event.

32 Focus
SundayStar
Israel wins whenever was the price before

Free speech can be costly, author finds

THROUGHOUT his career, Piper has been a controversial figure in the media, and his recent visit to Malaysia has been no exception. He is a "controversial" figure because he is an independent thinker, which is a rare quality in the 21st century. He is also a "controversial" figure because he is a Jew, which is a rare quality in the 21st century. He is also a "controversial" figure because he is a Jew, which is a rare quality in the 21st century. He is also a "controversial" figure because he is a Jew, which is a rare quality in the 21st century.



At the time of his visit to Malaysia, Piper was the only Jew to speak at the event. He was also the only Jew to be invited to speak at the event. He was also the only Jew to be invited to speak at the event. He was also the only Jew to be invited to speak at the event.

When Michael Collins Piper spoke at multiple venues in Malaysia in 2004 (and later, again, in 2006) his comments were treated respectfully by the independent-minded media in that thriving Asian republic. Shown above are two examples of the coverage accorded Piper's visit to Malaysia in 2004. This was in stark contrast to the harsh treatment that Piper (and other like-minded Americans) have received in the Zionist-controlled media in the United States, the topic of which Piper had thoroughly addressed when, in 2003, he lectured before the Zayed Centre—the official think tank of the Arab League—in Abu Dhabi. The complete, unabbreviated text of Piper's comments before the Zayed Centre is published here in this volume, beginning on the next page.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

Zionist Influence on the American Media: Its Impact on Media Coverage of the Middle East

What follows is the text of my presentation, on March 10, 2003, before the Zayed Center for Coordination and Follow-Up in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates.

I would like to thank His Highness Sheikh Zayed Bin Sultan Al Nahyan, the Arab League, the Zayed Centre and its staff, and all of those gathered here for honoring me with this opportunity to speak to you today.

My topic—the reason for the failure of the U.S. media to accurately portray the conflict between Israel and the Palestinian people and the resulting impact on U.S. Middle East policy—is certainly a timely one, more so than ever.

However, I would note this: The policies toward Israel and the Arab world being pursued by those who control the United States government today are not policies that would be endorsed by the American people if the American people had a full understanding of the history of the Middle East during the past century.

And this speaks directly to the question of media bias. It is precisely because of this media bias that Americans have failed, for so long, to understand the improper nature of the policies being pursued by their government.

The American mass media tells Americans, time and again, that in totalitarian states the governments control the media. Americans are told that this is wrong.

However, what Americans are NOT told is that in the United States today, the small group of tightly-knit families and financial interests who dominate the major media use that power to control the government and its policies.

Americans view television news as some form of entitlement—a public utility, much like water or electricity. The average American has no idea that the media is actually a tool for those who control it to use for the exercise of political power. Americans are good people, really, but are in many respects, very, very naïve.

I am here to tell you—very proudly—that for the last 23 years, more than half my life, I have been one of the few independent-minded American journalists who have attempted to provide balance and truth in reporting on the Middle East conflict. In fact, it was precisely because of this concern I entered into journalism in the first place: to combat the anti-Arab and anti-Muslim bias on the part of the media in America.

It hasn't been easy, needless to say, but it has been satisfying for I know that I have been on the side of truth and justice. Frankly, very few journalists in America can say that.

For many years, my good friend, Dr. Issa Nakhleh—the longtime representative in New York at the United Nations for the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine—sought to drive home to Americans a very simple thesis: “The Arabs are your friends. The Zionists are making them your enemies.”

So with that in mind, I am also here to bring you some good news: although the Zionist influence over the American media—and over American government policy making—is certainly greater than at any time in history, thanks to the expansion of the Internet and other independent media, the numbers of independent journalists in America who are now daring to speak out are growing by leaps and bounds.

And, as a direct consequence, more and more Americans—really, by the millions—are beginning to understand that there is more than one side to the story of the Middle East conflict and that the very cause of the ongoing crisis with Iraq—not to mention the tragic events of September 11, 2001, whomever may be responsible—is the ill-founded U.S. bias against the Arab (and Muslim) worlds.

So while, in some respects, I was very much a pioneer in the field of honest, accurate reporting about the Middle East—working alongside a relative handful of other like-minded Americans—I can say with satisfaction: I was ahead of my time. And now others are finally catching up.

All of that having been said, let me begin the formal part of my presentation by a very simple example that illustrates the pro-Israel bias on the part of the American media.

Did you know that on October 18, 1983 a suicide bomber—strapped with explosives and threatening to blow up the U.S. Capitol—was captured by police in the crowded spectators' gallery of the House of Representatives in the U.S. Capitol in Washington, DC?

If none of you assembled here today were aware of this incident, I would not be surprised—if only for the simple reason that most Americans themselves are—to this day—unaware of this very real threat against the U.S. Capitol and members of the U.S. Congress.

The truth is that this terrorist threat hardly made the news at all.

The reason, I contend, that this particular event—a would-be suicide bombing—did not reach a broad-ranging national and international audience is for one reason and one reason alone:

The individual who attempted this suicide bombing was an Israeli Jew—22 year old Israel Rabinowits.

To the best of my knowledge, this remarkable event was mentioned

just once in *The Washington Post*—the so-called newspaper of record in the American capital—and only once, in passing, in *The New York Times*.

And for the record, even though it was certainly qualified as “big” news, even *The Washington Post* buried the story in its local news section—across from the obituaries.

Evidently an attempt to by a suicide bomber to destroy the U.S. Capitol wasn't worthy of the front page in 1983.

Today, in fact, if you bother to check on the Internet you won't find even a mention of this event.

Wayne Todd, editor of the National Legislative Service & Security Association noted in the Nov. 1983 issue of his report that the story about the Israeli's attempt to bomb the Capitol was “virtually ignored by the media.”

Imagine—dare I say it—if the suicide bomber had been a Palestinian Arab. The story would have been on the front page of every newspaper in America. Every major network and newsmagazine would have devoted additional time and space to the topic of “Arab terrorism.” The Israeli lobby would have a field day. By this time there would have been a Hollywood film about the event. The officer who caught the would-be terrorist would have been on the cover of *People* magazine.

But the would-be terrorist was not an Arab. He was an Israeli. And therefore, the story disappeared into the classic Memory Hole.

Now this has been just a simple example of media bias, but it illustrates my point all too clearly.

And before anyone might suggest that accusations of media bias in favor of Israel are somehow rooted in so-called “rumors from the Muslim world” or the work of “Arab propagandists,” please allow me to note this:

While Americans didn't read about it in their daily newspaper or hear Dan Rather talking about it on CBS, on June 1, 2002 *Civiltà Cattolica*—an influential Jesuit journal sanctioned by the Vatican—actually fired a volley at the American media for its obsessive coverage of the ongoing Catholic Church sex scandals.

What is significant, for our context here, is that in tracing the media's interest in the church's troubles, the Vatican hinted at the behind-the-scenes power of the inter-connected handful of powerful pro-Israel families and financial interests who dominate the media monopoly in shaping the media's news coverage.

The Vatican-approved article flatly asserted that—at least in part because the Catholic Church refused to support the Persian Gulf War against Saddam Hussein in 1991—the controllers of the American media monopoly had nursed a grudge against the church.

And while the Vatican didn't say it directly, it is absolutely beyond question that it was the pro-Israel lobby that was the prime mover behind the war against Saddam—then, as today.

Given that—as the record indicates—the media's sudden and intense interest in the church's problems did, in fact, evolve after Sept. 11, it is interesting to note that *Civiltà Cattolica* also cited the aftermath of 9-11 in its dissection of the media's attacks on the church:

The journal suggested that the Catholic Church's appeals against "vendettas" against the Arab and Muslim world in the wake of 9-11 also offended the media, which has been heavily promoting an anti-Arab and anti-Muslim agenda.

Now while no one excuses either the Vatican or other church officials for misfeasance, malfeasance or non-feasance in handling the travesty of sexual abuse by priests, the truth is that the problem has been one of long-standing and has really been no secret whatsoever.

It was only after Sept. 11—as any content analysis of daily news coverage will affirm—that the American media began devoting so much space to the problem.

It is no exaggeration to conclude that much as the media has almost made the terms "Muslim" or "Arab" virtually synonymous with the word "terrorist," the term "Catholic" is now almost synonymous with the term "pedophile."

In fact, the Vatican's criticism of the media giants is not a new development. Several years ago, speaking before Corallo—the consortium of independent local radio and television channels in Italy, Pope John Paul II cited the rise of global media monopolies and emphasized the need for "local information"—that is, media voices outside the hands of the powerful media barons.

The Pope said that "communication has become the soul which shapes the culture of our time" and stressed what he called the "dignity" of independent media. And it is the independent media—of which I have been a part for my entire career—that has provided an alternative to the pro-Israel propaganda and disinformation that has so permeated the self-styled "mainstream" media in America today.

What then, is the source of the problem? Why is the media so skewed in favor of Israel?

In 1937, American muckraker Ferdinand Lundberg created a stir with a book entitled *America's Sixty Families*. His book was the first comprehensive look at the rising accumulation of vast wealth and influence by a small group of Americans—many of them inter-married families or otherwise connected through business relationships—who had come to dominate the American republic.

Lundberg opened that volume by making an assertion that—while quite true—opened the eyes of the American reading public to a reality that perhaps few had recognized:

The United States is owned and dominated today by a hierarchy of its sixty richest families, buttressed by no more than ninety families of lesser wealth.

This de facto government is actually the government of the United States—informal, invisible, shadowy. It is the government of money in a dollar democracy.

Under their acquisitive fingers, and in their possession, the sixty families hold the richest nation ever fashioned in the workshop of history

At the time Lundberg was writing, there was a solid core of substantial Jewish wealth among the "Sixty Families" listed. Times did change, however, and Jewish wealth and influence was on the ascendency. However, except in limited circles, the discussion of Jewish wealth and power remained largely a topic very much unspoken.

In this context, about the media, Lundberg noted: "The journalism of the United States, from top to bottom, is the personal affair—bought and paid for—of the wealthy families. There is little in American journalism today, good or bad, which does not emanate from the family dynasties." Lundberg called this phenomenon "the press of the plutocracy" and what he wrote about in 1937 continues to exist today—but more so.

In 1968 Lundberg came back with a sequel to *America's Sixty Families*. This new volume, *The Rich and the Super-Rich*, was an overview of the then-existing state of affairs in the secret world of the super-rich in America. In that second book, Lundberg made the rather interesting assessment of the situation, concluding that, in his choice words: "a relative handful of Americans are extravagantly endowed, like princes in the Arabian Nights tales."

Although Lundberg was quite right in his overall assessment about the accumulation of wealth and media power in a few hands, he fell down on one key point: Today's elite in America: Princes they are—but they are not Arabian.

While the major media tells Americans about the wealth of the Arab sheikhs and of the oil riches of the Middle East, Americans have no idea that the accumulated wealth of the American Jewish community—and the political influence that comes with it in every major city (and certainly in small cities and towns across America)—dwarfs that of those Arabian princes that so concerned this Jewish-American author.

America's "New Elite" today are unquestionably the wealthy and powerful Jewish families who—unlike the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the Roosevelts, the Kennedys, the Vanderbilts and the other "princes" of previous eras—have a considerably lower public profile than the non-Jewish American elite of the past.

American Jews are indeed the modern-day equivalents of the princes in the tales of the Arabian Nights.

And while the Jewish elite may not constitute a majority, per se, of the billionaires or the super-rich on the famous "Forbes 400," list, their combined wealth certainly rivals (most likely surpasses) that of the non-Jewish elite.

As such, the Jewish elite have used their wealth to amass a great deal of media control—and that is putting it lightly.

Pro-Israel Jewish families and/or financial interests control all three of the major news magazines: *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News & World Report*, not to mention both major national daily newspapers—*The Washington Post* and *The New York Times*. [And since the time that I spoke those words at the Zayed Center, even *The Chicago Tribune* and *The Los Angeles Times* now bear the distinction of being Jewish-controlled, both publications previously known as bastions of "WASP" publishing power in America—MCP.]

Even in the field of tabloid journalism—although most Americans don't know it—every single one of the sensational super-market tabloids is owned by one media outlet, a tightly-controlled corporation organized by an influential American Zionist figure, former Deputy Treasury Secretary Roger Altman.

In addition, every one of the major television networks is dominated by Jewish financial interests.

These media voices shape the American perception of the Middle East conflict. And aside from the high-level control of the networks, the newspapers and the newsmagazines, there remains the significant Jewish presence within the editorial and news staffs of these media outlets. In that regard, I will refer, exclusively, to the comments made by American Jewish writers who have touched on the subject.

Jewish-American writer Joel Kotkin, in his book, *Tribes*, asserts:

Although not in control of the media and the arts, as some anti-Semites suggest, Jews clearly possess a disproportionate influence in movies, publishing, advertising and theater. In the media, according to one survey in the 1970s, one quarter of the leading figures were Jewish, more than ten times their percentage in the general population.

J. J. Goldberg, writing in his book, *Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish Establishment*, declared:

It is true that Jews are represented in the media business in numbers far out of proportion to their share of the population.

Studies have shown that while Jews make up little more than 5 percent of the working press nationwide—hardly more than their share of the population—they make up one fourth or more of the writers, editors, and producers in America's "elite media," including network news divisions, the top newswEEKlies and the four leading daily papers (*New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Washington Post*, *Wall Street Journal*).

In the fast-evolving world of media megacorporations, Jews are even more numerous.

In an October 1994 *Vanity Fair* feature profiling the kingpins of the new media elite, titled "The New Establishment," just under half of the two dozen entrepreneurs profiled were Jews.

In the view of the magazines editors, these are America's true power elite, "men and women from the entertainment, communications and computer industries, whose ambitions and influence have made America the one true superpower of the Information Age."

Goldberg cites Eugene Fisher, the director of Catholic-Jewish relations for the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. Mr. Fisher has commented:

If there is Jewish power, it's the power of the word, the power of Jewish columnists and Jewish opinion makers. The Jewish community is a very literate community, and it has a lot to say. And if you can shape opinion, you can shape events.

Goldberg adds, referring to the Jewish predominance in the Hollywood film industry:

Hollywood at the end of the twentieth century is still an industry with a pronounced ethnic tinge. Virtually all the senior executives at the major studios are Jews.

Writers, producers, and to a lesser degree directors are disproportionately Jewish—one recent study showed the figure as high as 59 percent among top-grossing films.

The combined weight of so many Jews in one of America's

most lucrative and important industries gives the Jews of Hollywood a great deal of political power.

Pointing out, in the mid-1980s, that "Jews play an increasingly important role in journalism," Charles Silberman noted that:

In 1982, for example, Jews made up a little less than 6 percent of the national press corps as a whole but 25 to 30 percent of the "media elite"—those working for *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *The Wall Street Journal*; for *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News & World Report*; and for the news divisions of CBS, NBC, ABC, and the Public Broadcasting System and its leading stations. (A 1971 study put the number of Jews in the media elite at 25 percent.) When one looks at the key decision-making positions, the Jewish role appears to be even larger.

Silberman adds:

Jews are equally influential, if less well known, in the management of television news. It is the network correspondents, of course, who have become household names, among them Jews . . .

The greatest concentration of Jews, however, is at the producer level—and it is the producers who decide which stories will go on the air, and how long, and in what order they will run.

In 1982, before a shift in assignments, the executive producers of all three evening newscasts were Jewish, as were the executive producers of CBS's "60 Minutes" and ABC's "20/20." And Jews are almost equally prominent at the "senior producer" and "broadcast producer" levels as well as in senior management.

In his 1995 book, *Assimilation and Its Discontents*, Jewish author Barry Rubin also emphasizes how Jewish concerns permeate American popular culture in the print media. He pointed out how, for example, on just one single day—Oct. 18, 1992—the reviews section of *The Washington Post*:

[Was] full of books by or about Jews: on sports and the American Jewish experience; a biography of Bill Graham, a

Holocaust survivor and leading rock & roll impresario; the story of an upper-class New York family infected by antisemitism; a South African woman's group portrait of her set of Jewish friends; a Jewish couple's volume on foreign investments in America, analyzing problems of multiple loyalties and foreign influence parallel issues in assimilation; and a Jewish author's book on politics in higher education, discussing multiculturalism in terms drawn from the integration of Jews into American society.

Forgive me if I have belabored an all-too-obvious point. There is a very strong Jewish presence in the media. That presence bends the American media in a bias in favor of Israel and against the Arab world.

Professor Ben Bagdikian, a prominent media critic and author of the book, *The Media Monopoly*, has pointed out the dangers of a select few controlling the mass media:

The [media] lords of the global village have their own political agenda. All resist economic changes that do not support their own financial interests. Together, they exert a homogenizing power over ideas, culture and commerce that affects populations larger than any in history.

Neither Caesar nor Hitler, Franklin Roosevelt nor any Pope, has commanded as much power to shape the information on which so many people depend to make decisions about everything from whom to vote for to what to eat . . .

Monopolistic power dominates many other industries and most of them enjoy special treatment by the government.

But media giants have two enormous advantages:

They control the public image of national leaders who, as a result, fear and favor the media magnates' political agendas; and

They control the information and entertainment that help establish the social, political and cultural attitudes of increasingly larger populations . . .

In 1989, there were 11 major media giants emerging as the most powerful names in the global media monopoly. Since that time, those numbers have decreased even as the various media holdings of the smaller number of media monopolies have increased.

The comments of Bagdikian regarding the growing concentration of media ownership summarize the matter well:

When 50 men and women, chiefs of their corporations, control more than half the information and ideas that reach 249 million Americans, it is time for Americans to examine the institutions from which they receive their daily picture of the world.

Theirs is a strategy of total control. They buy every possible means of delivery (print, broadcast, films, etc). They strive to use their own rather than independently produced material. Then they convert it to as many forms of media as they control. Even the world's scholarly, scientific and technical journals are now largely controlled by the big media barons . . .

Based upon all of this, it is absolutely precise and fair to say that—largely because of its influence over the media, not to mention the vast accumulation of wealth and power in other realms—Zionist Power in America Today Is Greater Than in Any Country at any Time in Recorded History . . .

Jewish-American Professor Norman Cantor has encapsulated this immense power. In his controversial book, *The Sacred Chain*, widely criticized for its candor, Cantor wrote of Jewish power and affluence in America today:

Nothing in Jewish history equaled this degree of Jewish accession to power, wealth and prominence. Not in Muslim Spain, not in early 20th century Germany, not in Israel itself, because there were no comparable levels of wealth and power on a world-class scale in that small country to attain.

According to Cantor: "The Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Harrimans, the Roosevelts, the Kennedys, the titans of bygone eras, they have been superseded by the Jew as flawless achiever . . ."

So the media itself is largely dominated and substantially influenced from within by pro-Israel forces.

What happens in America when some independent journalist, some maverick political figure, or even a newspaper reporter devoted to the truth dares suggest something unpleasant about Israel?

It is then that a powerful force all its own swings into action. This organization is known as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith—or, "the ADL" for short.

The ADL, as many of you probably know, maintains close ties to Israel's Mossad and functions as an information gathering outlet for the Mossad.

The ADL also functions as a very aggressive public relations agency on behalf of Israel and against any and all critics of Israel.

Of particular interest is the ADL's use of undercover operatives to infiltrate and spy upon critics of U.S. favoritism toward Israel. The ADL maintains massive spy files on critics of Israel and doesn't hesitate to use those files in the most pernicious ways possible.

In late 1992, a major scandal erupted in San Francisco, California when—for reasons which remain murky to this day—both the FBI and the San Francisco Police Department raided the office of the ADL as well as the home of its top undercover operative, one Roy Bullock. The ADL was being investigated for illegal domestic spying and also the unauthorized use of police intelligence files.

I am proud to say that some seven years before Mr. Bullock was officially exposed as an ADL spy, I was the first journalist in America to expose Bullock as an ADL undercover operative, although, at the time, Bullock vehemently denied the charges.

I am also proud to say that when the FBI formally unmasked Bullock, the ADL said under questioning by the FBI that it was my expose of Bullock as an ADL undercover operative that set in motion the chain of events that ultimately led to the FBI-police raid on ADL headquarters in both San Francisco and Los Angeles.

The case proceeded so far that it was reported that the authorities were planning to seek criminal indictments of top ADL officials. The case was only dropped after pressure on the San Francisco District Attorney's office by the Jewish community.

And I should note this: During the ADL scandal, *The San Francisco Weekly*, a small progressive, alternative weekly, reported something that had never before been reported and which will be of particular interest to our audience here today:

This is the fact that, according to a former ADL employee in Manhattan, during the 1960's, prior to his assassination, the late Dr. Martin Luther King was viewed as a "loose cannon" by the ADL and was the target of its spying operations. In fact, the ADL turned the fruits of its "fact finding" over to J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI.

Suffice it to say that there have been reports (from sources close to Dr. King and his family) that prior to his assassination Dr. King was moving toward taking a public stand that Zionism is a form of racism.

In that regard—without pursuing the matter any further than this, I will tell you that Dr. King's alleged assassin, James Earl Ray—whose bid for exoneration was supported by King's own family, said early on that he believed that Israel's Mossad was behind Dr. King's assassination. And that, of course, is not something the American media ever reported.

In any case, despite such revelations, the ADL remains very much a part of the Zionist power bloc in America and the American media eagerly reports anything—repeat ANYTHING—that the ADL asserts without question.

The ADL (a unit of the Mossad) is a virtual adjunct of the pro-Israel media force in America today. You cannot discuss the American media bias in favor of Israel without discussing the role of the ADL.

In fact, since the Sept. 11 attacks, as you well know, the major media in the United States—particularly the broadcast media—has waged a continuing propaganda campaign against the Arab world, and Saudi Arabia in particular.

Hardly a week has gone by that there haven't been commentaries or questions raised along the line: "Are the Saudis really our friends?"—Or more, directly, it is often stated: "The Saudis are really not our friends. They are our enemies."

The media continues to put forth what is actually the Israeli opinion and propaganda line (disguised as "news") regarding Saudi Arabia.

The media campaign against the Saudis has been so intense that even the courtly and urbane Prince Bandar, the otherwise soft-spoken longtime Saudi ambassador to the United States, recently and correctly described much of the anti-Saudi propaganda by using a choice word that refers to barnyard droppings.

Although the overwhelming majority of the television audience and newspaper readers don't know it, many of the attacks on Saudi Arabia in the major media come practically verbatim from a 49-page "white paper" issued by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), a key public relations arm for the Israeli lobby.

Hidden behind the deliberately ambiguous and indifferent title *The U.S.-Saudi Relationship*, the ADL has circulated perhaps tens of thousands of copies of this propaganda screed to newspaper editors and reporters throughout the United States over the past twenty years.

In doing so, the ADL discreetly suggests that the document be used by editors and reporters as "background" in preparation of stories relating to Saudi Arabia.

Finding a handy "capsule" document at their disposal, reporters—who generally have no particular axe to grind one way or the other, or who otherwise know it is in their best interests to promote the Israeli propaganda line—quote the document freely and regularly, never revealing the ADL as the source.

Now, because of the pro-Israel bias within the media as a whole, coupled with the additional pressure from the outside, the work of such groups as the ADL, the media's failure to address all aspects of the

Middle East question has had a significant impact in a very broad historical sense.

The secret Israeli connection to at least several major political events in recent American history—often the real key to understanding these events—has been deliberately suppressed or ignored by the mass media in America.

What I am about to say will be controversial. But I will say it.

The three most talked-about and most serious political convulsions that rocked the American system of government during the last half of the 20th century can all be traced most directly and definitively to the continuing conflict over Palestine and the aggressive imperial role of Israel in Middle East affairs. I refer, of course, to:

- The assassination of John F. Kennedy,
- the Watergate scandal and the toppling of President Richard M. Nixon, and
- the Monica Lewinsky affair and the impeachment trial of President Bill Clinton.

And, needless to say, despite all the media uproar over each of these crises, the Middle East connection—that is, the Israeli connection—has gone unreported, except in independent media, such as, for example, my own newspaper, *American Free Press*.

Unfortunately, of course, I don't have the time to go into all of the details here, but I would like to attempt a brief overview.

Regarding the Kennedy Assassination—a topic of special interest to me, as you will see.

In 1992, former U.S. Congressman Paul Findley made the little-noticed but intriguing comment that "in all the words written about the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, has never been mentioned, despite the obvious fact Mossad complicity is as plausible as any of the other theories."

What Findley did not know was that, at that very moment, I was in the process of assembling a book, to be titled *Final Judgment*, which did indeed contend (and document) that the Mossad role alongside certain Mossad-allied elements inside the America CIA was the big secret—the "missing link"—that explained the entirety of the JFK assassination conspiracy.

Although my book *Final Judgment* has never been in any major bookstore, some 30,000 copies are in circulation—more copies than more widely-publicized books on the topic. It is truly an "underground best-seller." And I'm pleased to say that an Arabic-language translation has been published by the distinguished firm of Dar El Ilm Lilmalayin, based in Beirut. [As of 2010, some 50,000 copies of the book are circulating.]

Final Judgment documents that in 1963 JFK was embroiled in a bitter secret conflict with Israeli leader David Ben-Gurion over Israel's drive to build the atomic bomb; that Ben-Gurion resigned in disgust, saying that because of JFK's policies, Israel's "existence [was] in danger." Then upon JFK's assassination, U.S. policy toward Israel began an immediate 180-degree turnaround.

Israeli historian Avner Cohen's new book, *Israel and the Bomb*, confirms the conflict between JFK and Israel so powerfully that, Israel's Ha'aretz, declared Cohen's book a "bombshell" saying its revelations would "necessitate the rewriting of Israel's entire history."

Ethan Bronner, reviewing Cohen's book in *The New York Times*, called Israel's drive to build a nuclear bomb "a fiercely hidden subject," and indeed, at the time of the JFK assassination, it was.

And this, of course, explains why JFK researchers never considered an Israeli connection until my book, *Final Judgment*, supplied the missing pieces, assembling what I have called "the hidden picture on the other side of the jigsaw puzzle."

Although the American media has promoted a wide-ranging and often confusing variety of theories blaming various power interests for the JFK assassination, the very real Israeli connection was never once mentioned.

The Ha'aretz review of the book by Avner Cohen is quite interesting. It reads in part:

The murder of American President John E Kennedy brought to an abrupt end the massive pressure being applied by the U.S. administration on the government of Israel to discontinue the nuclear program.

Cohen demonstrates at length the pressures applied by Kennedy on Ben-Gurion. He brings the fascinating exchange of letters between the two, in which Kennedy makes it quite clear to the Israeli prime minister that he will under no circumstances agree to Israel becoming a nuclear state.

The book implied that, had Kennedy remained alive, it is doubtful whether Israel would today have a nuclear option.

I couldn't put it better myself.

According to historian Stephen Green:

Perhaps the most significant development of 1963 for the Israeli nuclear weapons program, however, occurred on November 22 on a plane flying from Dallas to Washington, D.C.,

Lyndon Baines Johnson was sworn in as the 36th President of the United States, following the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

And as Green summarized it: "In the early years of the Johnson administration the Israeli nuclear weapons program was referred to in Washington as 'the delicate topic.' Lyndon Johnson's White House saw no Dimona, heard no Dimona, and spoke no Dimona when the reactor went critical in early 1964."

Thus it was that the critical point of dispute between John F. Kennedy and the Mossad-dominated government of Israel was no longer an issue. The new American president, Lyndon Johnson—so long a partisan of Israel—allowed the nuclear development to continue. This was just the beginning.

Now while all of this presents a strong motive for Israel to strike against JFK, my book *Final Judgment* also documents what even maverick Israeli journalist Barry Chamish has admitted is "a pretty cogent case" for Mossad collaboration in the assassination conspiracy.

The fact is that when New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison prosecuted trade executive Clay Shaw with conspiracy in the assassination, Garrison had stumbled upon the Mossad link.

Although (after his acquittal) Shaw was revealed to have been a CIA asset, in 1963 also Shaw served on the board of a Rome-based company, Permindex, which was actually a front for a Mossad-sponsored arms procurement operation.

A primary shareholder in Permindex, the Banque De Credit Internationale of Geneva, was not only the fiefdom of Tibor Rosenbaum, a high-level Mossad official, but also the chief money laundry for Meyer Lansky, "chairman" of the American organized crime syndicate and long-time Israeli loyalist.

The chief executive of Permindex was Louis Bloomfield of Montreal, a top figure in the Israeli lobby and an operative of the Bronfman family, intimate Lansky associates and leading patrons of Israel.

Permindex was clearly the Israeli link to the JFK assassination, so much so that Jim Garrison later circulated the manuscript for a never-published novel in which he fingered the Mossad as prime mover behind the conspiracy.

The Permindex link also explains the often-discussed "French connection" to the JFK assassination.

However, only my book, *Final Judgment*, has explained precisely what the French connection really was:

That is, that Permindex was also involved in assassination attempts against French President Charles DeGaulle by the French "Secret Army Organization" (OAS) which itself had close ties to the Mossad.

Like the OAS, the Israelis hated DeGaulle not only because he gave independence to Algeria, a major new Arab state, but also because DeGaulle, who had assisted Israel, had withdrawn support, objecting (as did JFK) to Israel's drive for an atomic arsenal.

A French intelligence officer revealed to me that the Mossad contracted out one of JFK's assassins—probably a Corsican hitman—through a French intelligence official who was disloyal to DeGaulle and who hated JFK for supporting Algerian independence.

JFK was also planning a strike against Red China's nuclear bomb program—a plan scuttled by Lyndon Johnson within a month of JFK's assassination. During this same period, in fact, Israel and Red China were involved in joint secret nuclear bomb research with a key player in the Permindex web, Shaul Eisenberg, serving as the Mossad's liaison with China.

And again, I should note: the American media has been loathe to mention the fact that Israel and Red China's nuclear arms collaboration goes back to the early 1960s—another big secret kept from the American people.

My book *Final Judgment* was first to point out that James Angleton, the CIA liaison to the Mossad, was a devoted partisan of Israel who not only orchestrated the scenario linking accused assassin Lee Oswald to the Soviet KGB but who later circulated disinformation to confuse investigations into the assassination.

I would submit to you here today that Hollywood's Oliver Stone failed to mention these details in his famous film *JFK* because that film was financed by Arnon Milchan, an Israeli arms dealer linked to smuggling of materiel to Israel's nuclear program—the point of contention between JFK and Israel.

Although Israeli diplomat Uri Palti called the thesis of my book "nonsense," and pro-Israel columnist George Will declared it "vicious intellectual licentiousness," *The Los Angeles Times* grudgingly admitted that *Final Judgment* was "novel indeed," saying it "weave[s] together some of the key threads in a tapestry that many say is unique."

The very week in 1997 the American Library Association sponsored "Banned Books Week," the aforementioned Anti-Defamation League (the ADL) created an uproar, forcing cancellation of a college seminar on the JFK assassination because I had been invited to speak.

The ADL feared "impressionable" students might take my thesis seriously. That same ADL feels that American college students are quite pre-

pared, on the other hand, to fight and die for Israel.

The very strength of my book, according to many readers who are familiar with other data on the JFK assassination, is that it shows how all of the more familiar theories about the assassination are connected—and that connection is indeed the Israeli connection.

To this day, eight years after the release of the book:

- No one has been able to rebut the thesis, misquoted any of my sources or quoted any of my sources out of context.
- No one has been able to demonstrate where any of the key points in my thesis are refuted by other information.
- No one has cited any specific errors (relevant to the thesis) that would contradict my thesis.

Considering the energetic and very public efforts of the ADL to defame this book, one would think that the ADL would assemble a crack team of researchers to tear the book apart. And bear in mind that if the book were so much nonsense, the ADL would not pay *Final Judgment* the attention that they do.

In light of Israel's unhindered production of weapons of mass destruction—and the apparent role of Israel's Mossad in the assassination of the one president who tried to stop it, I would ask those assembled here to give the Arabic edition of my book the widest distribution and firmest endorsement possible.

The world does need to know who really killed John F. Kennedy and why. The evidence demonstrates that there is a very strong foundation for my thesis. It is a scenario that does make sense, much to the dismay of my critics. *Final Judgment* encapsulates a thesis that they can't discredit. The genie is out of the bottle and neither *Final Judgment* nor its thesis are about to go away.

So much for the JFK assassination.

What about the media-orchestrated assassination of Richard M. Nixon—remembered today as Watergate? Again, we find an Israeli connection but one that the major media prefers to keep under wraps.

In March of 1974 President Nixon sent General Vernon Walters, who was then deputy director of the CIA, as his special representative for a secret meeting with two PLO leaders, Khalad Hassan and Majed Abu Sharar, who represented, respectively the so-called "right" and "left" wings of Fatah, the largest and most influential of the Palestinian factions that made up the PLO.

Although the meeting evidently ended with great promise of working out a comprehensive Middle East settlement, British journalist Alan Hart reports that not long afterward, Henry Kissinger sabotaged that back-channel effort by President Nixon to achieve peace.

Although the details are spelled out clearly in Hart's biography of Yasser Arafat, few Americans know—although they should know—that Chairman Arafat and the two Hassan brothers told Hart, in Hart's words, "that they were convinced that the government of Israel and the Jewish lobby in America had made use of the Watergate affair to break Nixon before he forced Israel to make the necessary withdrawals for peace."

Khalad Hassan also told Hart that he (Hassan) had discussed Nixon's continuing back-channel peace initiatives with then-King Feisal of Saudi Arabia who had played a part in the effort. Evidently, according to Hart's rendition, President Nixon himself told King Feisal this:

If [Nixon] found his way blocked by Israel and the Jewish lobby, he would throw away his prepared text when he made his next State of the Union report [in January of 1975] and that he would tell the people of America, live on TV and radio, the whole truth about how Israel and its friends in America were the obstacle to peace.

In other words, Nixon was preparing to expose the way in which the Government of Israel and its supporters in America controlled American foreign policy.

President Nixon never had the opportunity to make such a bold move. The media focus on the burgeoning Watergate scandal drove him from office. Thanks to an inside source today remembered as "Deep Throat," *The Washington Post* led the drumbeat for Nixon's removal from office.

In that regard it is interesting to note that former American diplomat Richard Curtiss, executive editor of *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, stated frankly in 1995 that "it's long been our opinion that whoever played the role of 'Deep Throat' was in fact only a conduit for information collected by Israel's Mossad and used to discredit Nixon," and that Nixon's attempt to reassess U.S. relations with Israel was "the catalyst that led directly to his downfall."

There is, in fact, evidence that the enigmatic source "Deep Throat" was, at the least, an indirect operative of Israel's Mossad. In her book, *Katharine the Great*, a critical biography of Katharine Graham, the late publisher of *The Washington Post*, Jewish-American journalist Debra Davis has almost certainly provided the real key to Watergate.

Miss Davis presents a solid case that the *Post's* famed Watergate source—"Deep Throat"—was most likely Richard Ober, the right-hand man of James Angleton, the CIA's counterintelligence chief and longtime and Israeli-allied liaison to the Mossad.

Miss Davis revealed that Ober was in charge of a joint CIA-Israeli counterintelligence desk established by Angleton inside the Nixon White House.

From this listening post, Ober (at Angleton's direction) provided inside information about Watergate that helped bring down the Nixon administration.

So despite all that you—and the American people—have heard from the major media about Watergate, this information is not something that is in widespread distribution. Suffice it to say, based on what we have discussed here today, I think you understand why.

[Although, in subsequent years, Watergate reporter Robert Woodward has claimed that his source was actually a former FBI official named Mark Felt, there are many—including yours truly—who doubt Woodward's words regarding this matter—MCP]

Now . . . what of Bill Clinton's impeachment affair—the third great political crisis to rock the American system of government during the last quarter of the 20th century?

Where in the world could anyone ever divine an underlying Israeli involvement in that sordid business?

Of course, Bill Clinton's problems were very much of his own making. However, bear in mind that the Israelis and their powerful lobby—in league with pro-Israel forces in the major media—took great advantage of the affair.

As a starting point, note that it was none other than William Kristol who was one of the first individuals to float the Monica Lewinsky story publicly.

Many of you are probably familiar with William Kristol, now a prominent media figure who is perhaps the leading media publicist for the misdeeds of the now-infamous Richard Perle, the leading Arab-hating fanatic advising the Bush administration today.

Not only is young Kristol the front man for media tycoon Rupert Murdoch—a major ally of Israel's hard-line Likud—but Kristol himself is the son of journalist Irving Kristol and historian Gertrude Himmelfarb, major "neoconservative" figures with long-standing close ties to Israel's right wing. Like his parents, Kristol is a "Likudnik" and during the Clinton years he emerged as a prominent and harsh critic of President Clinton's decision—as the hard-line Likudnik's perceived it—to "turn his back" on the state of Israel.

It should not be forgotten, in this context, that on January 26, 1998, just as the Lewinsky affair began escalating and engulfing Clinton, Kristol released a letter to Clinton, pressuring the president to launch a military attack on Israel's hated enemy, Iraq.

Signing the letter along with Kristol were a bevy of other famed American supporters of Israel's "right wing" including notably, Richard Perle, a former deputy secretary of defense and highly-paid consultant for Israeli arms interests who now serves as a top advisor to the Bush administration.

Rupert Murdoch's Fox News Channel carried the story almost non-stop around the clock. Even when other features were telecast, they were subject to interruption for any breaking developments in the Clinton scandal, regardless of how mundane they might be.

One daytime Fox tabloid show even brought in a reported specialist in "body language" to view a videotape of Clinton and Miss Lewinsky meeting in a receiving line after which the so-called specialist declared Clinton was treating the young girl as though she were "the first lady."

And please note also that on the eve of the first major wave of stories linking Clinton to Miss Lewinsky, even prior to his official meeting with President Clinton, the Israeli prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu had already met with (and appeared at a pro-Likud rally in the company of) Rev. Jerry Falwell, one of Clinton's most vociferous critics.

Even *The Washington Post* itself revealed on January 22, 1998 that "a senior Netanyahu official had said the Israeli leader was prepared to respond to opposition from the White House by demonstrating his 'own ammunition' in U.S. political circles"—namely Falwell and the boisterous pro-Zionist "Christian right."

In fact, the Lewinsky scandal forced the president into retreat as far as pushing Israel was concerned—much to the delight of Israel's right.

[Some years later, just before his death, Jerry Falwell admitted in an interview with Vanity Fair magazine that, in fact, he and Israel's Netanyahu had deliberately orchestrated the aforementioned meeting at precisely that time for the very deliberate purpose of putting pressure on the Clinton administration.]

And that was an interesting admission, inasmuch as, later, when the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and other Jewish lobby forces were denouncing my presentation at the Zayed Center, they suggested that my claims regarding Falwell and Netanyahu were a sordid "conspiracy theory" of anti-Semitic intent—MCP]

Clinton, of course, survived the impeachment and the Senate trial that followed, but there is no doubt that his ability to pursue any policy that might have stunted Israel's hard-line Likud government had been thoroughly sabotaged.

The Lewinsky scandal—manipulated as it was by the American media—put the Clinton administration on the edge for the rest of its days. And that was very clearly the intent.

So it is: the power of the media not only to influence American perception of the Middle East policy of the United States, but also to influence that policy itself.

It is all part of the secret history of the 20th century.

There is much more than can and should be said.

But I will close with this warning and reminder:

Writing in *Time* on Feb. 17, 2003 Charles Krauthammer, one of the most widely-touted pro-Zionist fanatics in the American media today announced that the proposed war against Iraq "is not just to disarm Saddam. It is to reform a whole part of the world."

"What the U.S. needs in the Arab world," he said, "is not an exit strategy but an entry strategy. Iraq is the beckoning door . . ."

Krauthammer and his like-minded colleagues in the media and in the "neo-conservative" circles surrounding Richard Perle and others who are guiding the Bush administration's Middle East policy are intent upon waging war on the entire Islamic world. Krauthammer frankly names their targets: "Iran, Saudi Arabia, Syria and beyond."

Note those ominous words: "And beyond."

The Prophet Muhammad, I am told, once said that "One learned man is harder on the devil than a thousand ignorant worshipers."

I am here to say that Charles Krauthammer and those of his ilk represent the devil and not until there is a truly free press in America will we be able to turn so many ignorant Americans into learned men.

I thank you again, with all my heart, for this great honor of addressing you here today.

There are indeed many, many Americans who admire the Arab and Muslim peoples and many more who would do so if only they knew the truth that is being kept from them by the major media.

I encourage the people and leaders of the Arab world to extend their hands of friendship and support to those independent-minded journalists and media voices who do dare to speak out. Working together, we can achieve a just and peaceful resolution to the ongoing crisis in the Middle East that threatens to destroy our world.

The Jewish Lobby Roars: Zionist Pressure Results in Shut-Down of the Arab League Think Tank

Not surprisingly, two major units of the pro-Israel propaganda lobby in the United States were quite exercised over the fact that I had been a guest lecturer before a scholarly body in the Arab world—the official think tank of the Arab League, no less.

And as a direct result of Jewish lobby demands on the United States government, the administration of President George W. Bush pressured the government of the United Arab Emirates, the primary sponsor of the Abu Dhabi-based Zayed International Centre for Coordination and Follow-Up, to cease funding and shut down the think tank.

The shutdown of the center came after the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith and the Middle East Media Research Institute (MEMRI)—founded by a former Israeli intelligence officer—issued blustering reports to the press condemning the center for featuring not only me but other independent voices among their extensive roster of speakers from around the world.

The ADL and MEMRI were *particularly* concerned about *my* presence among the speakers.

Named up front as a major “villain” both in the ADL and MEMRI reports was yours truly. The ADL report named me not once, but three consecutive times. (Earlier in the opening pages of this volume, I noted some of the lies and deceptions appearing in the ADL report.)

The fact that even a wealthy Arab state such as the UAE would be forced to buckle to Zionist demands—engineered through the aegis of the U.S. government—was sad and revealing, to say the least.

And in light of what happened, I should again note that while in Abu Dhabi, I was told by the director of the Zayed Center that the U.S. Embassy in Abu Dhabi had called the center to complain about my lecture.

Needless to say, I find it telling that the rulers of the United States—my country—launched a war against Iraq in the name of ‘fighting for democracy and freedom,’ yet an official of my own nation would dare tell my Arab hosts that they had no right to sponsor a speaker such as I.

This was not only an insult to the intelligence of my hosts, but it was also an affront to my First Amendment right as an American to speak out and exercise a liberty that American authorities are constantly saying is violated by Saddam and other leaders of the Arab world.

Despite all the lip service by the U.S. government to the concept of “freedom,” that freedom seems to stop when criticism of Israel or U.S. policy toward Israel is concerned. What hypocrisy.

As long as the Arabs are talking only to each other, the Israelis have no problem with that.

But the moment the Arabs, through forums such as the Zayed Centre, reach out to other peoples, that’s when the Israelis really get angry. They cannot stand the thought that anyone anywhere might be exposed to anything other than a pro-Israel point of view.

In fact, the ADL-MEMRI assault on the Zayed Centre was not only part of an ongoing campaign to disrupt the work of the center and to undermine the conservative, pro-American regime of Sheik Zayed, ruler of Abu Dhabi, capital province of the United Arab Emirates, but also part of a much more broad-ranging campaign by “neo-conservative” imperialist-minded elements to destabilize the entire Arab world.

The ADL and MEMRI joined forces to directly tackle Sheik Zayed of Abu Dhabi after a Harvard graduate student in theology raised loud objections to the fact that the sheik—a generous contributor to academic, social and cultural causes throughout the entire world—made a donation to the Harvard Divinity School to endow a chair in Islamic studies.

In campaigning against the donation, which she demanded that Harvard return, the student—who is Jewish—cited alleged “anti-American” and “anti-Semitic” statements made by a variety of speakers who addressed the Zayed Centre, which was named in honor of Sheik Zayed and chaired by his son, Sheik Sultan, who was also deputy prime minister.

The implicit message of the ADL-MEMRI attack on the Zayed Centre and on the Arab world was that criticism of Israel is, by its very nature, “anti-Semitic,” and that criticism of Israel or criticism of U.S. favoritism toward Israel (said to be America’s “best ally”) is somehow “anti-American.”

So, you see, the terms “anti-Semitic” and “anti-American” have thus become welded in an Orwellian fashion into one, and those who dare raise questions that offend Israel in some way are automatically deemed dangerous and a potential threat to American interests—perhaps even “supporters of terrorism.”

All of this is part and parcel of the New World Order linguistics that have become so central to the rhetoric and discussion in American society today—and it is coming from the Jewish community and those who do its bidding.

Considering this bellicose (and even threatening) behavior on the part of the organized Jewish community, trampling on traditional American freedoms, is it really any surprise that there is, in fact, anti-Semitism, that people are simply getting fed up with never-ending Jewish pressure and Jewish hysterics?

There will come a time of reckoning—of that I’m sure—and the Jews will have only themselves to blame.



The Jerusalem Post reported on July 25, 2004 that former Israeli nuclear technician Mordechai Vanunu (left) charged in an interview with the London-based Arabic newspaper, *al-Hayat*, that he believed that John F. Kennedy's assassination was the direct result of JFK's efforts to prevent Israel from building nuclear weapons. Vanunu was first introduced to this thesis, put forth in Michael Collins Piper's book, *Final Judgment*, by another prominent Israeli dissident, Israel Shamir. Vanunu—who has been nominated repeatedly for the Nobel Peace Prize, has issued warm words of support for the work of Michael Collins Piper as outlined in this chapter. For his own part, Piper has commented that Vanunu—whom he has met by telephone—is a spiritual giant.



The year 2004 was quite momentous for Michael Collins Piper who traveled, for the first time, to Asia where he opened up friendships with two remarkable individuals: at left, Malaysian attorney and diplomat Matthias Chang, and right, the late Dr. Ryu Ohta, an outspoken Japanese nationalist. Piper is a strong advocate of what his own longtime publisher, Willis A. Carto, has referred to as the concept of "international nationalism"—unity and cooperation between like-minded peoples across the globe, standing in opposition to the Jewish Imperium that is known as the New World Order. Zionist forces reacted with a frenzy upon learning of Piper's efforts to build bridges with Asian nationalists. The global Jewish elite work relentlessly to keep other races and cultures fighting one another.

CHAPTER TWENTY

Simon Wiesenthal's Henchman— A Hookworm From Hell—

But the ADL and the Middle East Media Research Institute were not the only voices of the Jewish power elite to raise up in a frenzy over my travels abroad. In 2004—a little over a year after I had visited Abu Dhabi to lecture at the ill-fated Zayed Center—I was invited to travel to Asia to lecture before audiences in Malaysia and Japan where my books *Final Judgment* and *The High Priests of War* were being published.

My very memorable visit to Malaysia came first where I spoke before multiple large audiences in an array of diverse forums, including the International Islamic University, the Center for International Studies at the Universiti Sains Malaysia, the Malaysian Bar Council, a forum sponsored by the Chinese-language *Oriental News*, and one held under the auspices of the respected International Movement for a Just World, a private human rights organization.

During that visit I had the opportunity to become acquainted and forge a valued friendship with well-known attorney and world-traveling diplomat, Matthias Chang, a Christian of Chinese descent who had served as a cabinet-level advisor to Malaysia's highly-regarded recently-retired longtime former Prime Minister, Mahathir Mohamad, one of the towering figures of Asia and indeed of the entire Muslim world.

Since that time, by the way, Chang's three important books in his "Future Fastforward" trilogy—*Future Fastforward*, *Brainwashed for War*, and *The Shadow Money Lenders*—have been published in first-ever American editions by my own publisher, *American Free Press*, to what has been much acclaim by American readers who've been intrigued by the unique outlook (from a foreign point of view) of this Malaysian intellectual who shares their same concerns about the interconnected global influence of Zionist power and international finance.

I was also quite honored, I must say, when Dr. Sanusi bin Junid, the president of the International Islamic University, publicly declared me a "zhimmi"—the Muslim term for a non-Muslim "protected one" in the Muslim world—in recognition of my literary efforts which, he said, constituted the necessary tribute required from a zhimmi under Muslim tradition before such an honor can be bestowed.

You can imagine my real pleasure when an audience of some 300 young Muslim students from all over the world—gathered there at the university—roared their friendly approval of Dr. Sanusi's words.

Although Jewish trouble-makers and allied hit-and-run racketeers in the United States and elsewhere who make big money stirring up anti-

Muslim animus point hysterically to the term "zhimmi" as some form of "Muslim evil," it is anything but that. And I am proud to call myself a "zhimmi" and to Hell with the Jews and Christians (and anybody else) who would use it as a term of derision (as they do).

Not long after my trip to Malaysia I ventured to Japan where I spoke under the auspices of the Institute for the Critique of Contemporary Civilization, chaired by the venerable and courtly longtime Japanese nationalist Dr. Ryu Ohta who provided me wonderful hospitality during my week-long visit to Tokyo.

Although Dr. Ohta spoke no English and I spoke no Japanese, his valued assistant, Grace-Eki Oyama, provided translation. However, I soon discovered that quite often—because Dr. Ohta and I thought so much alike—he knew what I was saying and I knew what he was saying, even before we were finished speaking and before our words had been fully translated. That was remarkable, to say the least, and a very real bond was formed and one I treasure, particularly now that Dr. Ohta is gone.

And, if anything, it confirms the very real nature of what my longtime colleague, Willis A. Carto, has referred to as "international nationalism"—the natural congruence and logical like-minded alliance between all peoples and nations worldwide who value their independence from the pernicious Jewish Utopia—a would-be Global Planation under Zionist rule—known generally as the would-be New World Order.

And I should mention, on a very personal note, that when I went to Japan, I took with me two special items. One was my late father's U.S. Marine identification card that he carried with him when he was in Asia, fighting the Japanese in a war that he subsequently came to realize was a war that need not and should not have been fought.

By touching coincidence, I spent Thanksgiving Day in Japan, fifty-nine years after my own father spent Thanksgiving in the Pacific in 1945, having survived that bloody Jewish War of Survival.

It seemed to me quite appropriate that my father's Marine ID made that journey across the water once again in what was really, in its own unique respect, a "peace mission" forging a new alliance between American and Japanese nationalists against the modern-day incarnation of the very New World Order forces that had brought their nations (and the entire world) into a destructive war.

The other item I took was a very special gift that I presented Dr. Ohta. It was a copy of an outrageous World War II-era propaganda tome entitled *Under Cover*, written by one John Roy Carlson, a paid agent of the Anti-Defamation League.

The book bore the signature of its former owner, the late Ralph M. Townsend—a former American diplomat who spent time in Japan and

who deeply respected the Japanese people—and who fought relentlessly against the efforts by what Charles Lindbergh correctly described as the scheming by "the British, the Jews and the Roosevelt administration" to involve the American nation in World War II.

Townsend—like many other American nationalists of his day—was smeared in the pages of that book (formerly belonging to Townsend) that I presented to Dr. Ohta, who deeply appreciated the sentiment in which it was presented.

It seemed appropriate, too, that this book—which had belonged to someone who was a friend of the Japanese people and who paid a mighty price for his efforts, being charged with "sedition" and sent to jail by the Roosevelt administration—should journey back to the land that Townsend knew so well.

So—needless to say—my visits to Malaysia and Japan (two nations that I would have never dreamed of visiting, any more than I would have expected to have visited Russia or Abu Dhabi as I had done before) were momentous times in my life and a direct result of my having made the decision to devote my life to fighting global Jewish tyranny.

In any event, the Jewish Thought Police were most distressed that I had forged friendly ties with individuals and institutions in Asia that are not easily cowed by forces in the United States and the West which are, for their own part, enthusiastic advocates for the interests of Israel.

Evidence of this Jewish outrage came in a bizarre article in the November 29, 2004 issue of *Asia Times*, a journal published in the international city of Hong Kong where global financial interests have immense clout. The article—by a Malaysia-based American youth, Keith Andrew Bettinger—was published just as I returned from Japan.

Bettinger made the amazing (and actually racist) assertion that Asian audiences are essentially naïve and inexperienced and easily tricked by wily Westerners such as me who, Bettinger asserted, are masking vicious "hate" in the guise of freedom of speech.

The article expressed immense displeasure that my speaking appearances in Kuala Lumpur, for example, were warmly received by wide-ranging audiences of intellectuals, businessmen, industrialists, attorneys and others who are widely and rightly suspicious of the "mainstream" media in the United States which—I accurately asserted while addressing my Asian audiences—is under the tight control of a handful of families and financial cliques aligned with the Israeli lobby.

Bettinger assaulted Malaysians in general by sneering at what he called "Malaysians' love of conspiracy" and went on to bitterly denounce former Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad, who had long been smeared by the international media for daring to not only denounce the med-

dling in Malaysia's affairs by global money speculators such as George Soros but for also freely discussing, in open public forums, the power of the Israeli lobby in influencing American foreign policy.

Personally, I took it as a singular honor that Bettinger slammed me alongside a respected figure such as Dr. Mohamad. It didn't go unnoticed in Malaysia that Bettinger made a point of smearing the nation's former prime minister, nor would Malaysians fail to notice the notably racist tone of Bettinger's suggestion that they are people who are somehow unable to grasp the realities of international affairs without manipulative guidance from sneaky Occidentals such as myself.

Although the article contained numerous factual errors which I subsequently corrected in a letter published in the *Asia Times*, the bottom line was that Bettinger relied almost exclusively on voices critical of me (and of my publisher, *American Free Press*) as his very dubious sources, lamely noting that I had failed to respond to an interview request (which request, by the way, I did not receive until after I returned from Japan and after it was too late to respond).

Bettinger's chief font of wisdom was Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the well-funded Simon Wiesenthal Center, a shrill propaganda outlet that complements the work of the ADL. In addition, according to Bettinger, an un-named "media watcher" claimed that "Nobody takes [Piper] seriously in the United States."

This claim is interesting, if only because of the fact that two major endorsements for the thesis of my book, *Final Judgment* (regarding Israeli involvement in the JFK assassination) came from a former high-ranking Pentagon official (Col. Donn de Grand Pre) and a former high-ranking U.S. State Department official, Dr. Herbert L. Calhoun, who posted an enthusiastic review of the book on the Internet at amazon.com.

The fact that the ADL and the Wiesenthal Center seemed to be so anxious to discredit me and *American Free Press* and advise Asian audiences that we must be studiously ignored should raise the question: Why do they go to such lengths to discredit those whom they say are not to be taken seriously in the first place?

Evidently *American Free Press* and I personally must have seemed "credible" to enough people in the United States and elsewhere or these hate-mongers wouldn't have been so concerned.

The Wiesenthal Center's Rabbi Cooper lied and said I was saying "nasty things about America." Here is my response to the emanations of this Jewish clergyman whom I've dubbed a "Hellish Hookworm":

The truth is that neither AFP nor I have never said nasty things about America, although spokesman for Israel have

worked overtime during the past several years to equate criticism of Israeli atrocities and outrages against Christian and Muslim Palestinians—including Israeli military attacks on Christian churches in Palestine—with criticism of America.

Some years ago—before flag waving became fashionable in America, as a result of efforts by the media to stoke up American grassroots support for wars in defense of Israel's interests—a pro-Israel fanatic called me a "flag waving super patriot" because I said AFP was for a foreign policy that placed "America First."

However, the fact is that that my point of view has never changed and neither has that of *American Free Press*. We are for America first. Those who are now wrapping themselves in the American flag are not patriots, no matter how much they claim to be. The people of Malaysia are not as stupid and ready to buy the propaganda of the Israeli lobby as trouble-makers like Abe Cooper might like to believe.

This was not the first time that I had been attacked by Simon Wiesenthal's Hellish Hookworm who—by the way—rakes in a fantastic salary as a much-publicized hatchet man for the Jewish elite.

When my book *Final Judgment* finally began to receive favorable and widespread reception, the Hookworm attacked me personally and likewise savaged Syria's then-Defense Minister Mustafa Tlas—an unswerving critic of Zionist intrigues—after Tlas publicly endorsed the thesis of my book. So I take much delight in knowing that the sordid likes of Cooper and his ilk find me so troublesome. And I take great honor in that a genuine statesman, such as Mustafa Tlas, honored me with an endorsement of the thesis of my book.

Likewise, I was especially pleased when Dr. Ohta—who had hosted me in Japan—issued his own broadside in response to the mendacious propaganda and smears by this Jewish rabbi. Dr. Ohta wrote:

In a time of tsunamic ideological shifts, in which audacious propagandists are relentlessly engaged in frenzied efforts to rewrite the facts of history, to challenge these truth-twisters Michael Collins Piper arrives: the American Voltaire, an enlightened thinker and polemicist who has no fear of confronting harsh realities, doing so with elegance and verve.

In recent years Piper has emerged as the unrivaled ambassador of the American nationalist movement to peoples all across the planet: from Moscow to Abu Dhabi to Kuala Lumpur and on to Tokyo and Toronto and Tehran.

In no uncertain terms, he has issued a clarion call—a rallying cry—for all of us to join together, to reclaim our heritage and to sweep away the corruption of international capital and the consequent malign force that's come in its wake, driving our world to the brink of nuclear annihilation.

Piper's message is loud and clear:

Real Americans do not support the Zionist scheme to exploit America's military might to conquer the globe; that good people who oppose the Zionist Imperium must put aside differences and close ranks, united for the final battle.

Passionate, making no pretense of being without bias, Piper identifies and savages those who manifest attitudes of open hatred for nationalism and freedom.

Having fashioned historical writing into an art form, Piper has few peers. Nor are there many who speak truth to power as Piper does so well.

Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Center has said that, because Piper criticizes Israel, he is "anti-American." In fact, Piper's work proves precisely how pro-American he is.

Perhaps the icing on the cake, so to speak, was when Israel's "prisoner of conscience," Mordechai Vanunu—who spent 18 years in prison in Israel, eleven years in solitary confinement, convicted of treason and espionage for having given *The London Sunday Times* inside information that unveiled and confirmed Israel's secret program for the construction of atomic weapons of mass destruction—issued his own declaration of support for my efforts.

In conjunction with the release of a collection of my writings, *Dirty Secrets: Crime, Conspiracy & Cover-Up in the 20th Century*—compiled and published by the no-nonsense team of Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani—Vanunu wrote:

Over the years, much has been written about the creature known as the state of Israel. Most of what has been written about Israel and accepted by those in the West is not true. Israel has been painted as being a non-threatening friend to humanity, who merely wishes to live in peace with the rest of the world. I have seen the beast up close, however, and I can tell you that this is not the case. There are only a few individuals who are brave and honest enough to paint her in her true light, and one of them is Michael Collins Piper in his books such as *Final Judgment*, *The High Priests of War* and *The New Jerusalem*.

To say that this was an "honor"—coming from Vanunu, who has been nominated multiple times for the Nobel Peace Prize—is an understatement, to say the very least.

But on a more important basis, it reflects the fact that there are people of conscience—such as Vanunu—who refuse to be bent and broken by the forces that are determined to rule or ruin.

My own experience with these monsters obviously so pitifully pales in comparison to what Mordechai dealt with during his years of imprisonment and the harassment that he's suffered in the wake of his release from prison. So I can only shine in the light of Vanunu's goodness.

The truth is that there are millions—no, billions—of people all over the world who are looking for leaders who will stand up like Vanunu and fight for what is right.

On several occasions, some years ago, my friends Mark Glenn and Stan Hess and I conducted radio interviews with Mordechai and I can say, truly, that Mark and I both felt—despite the thousands of miles and a connection only by telephone wire—that we were (and I don't exaggerate) in the presence of someone who was a spiritual giant—a "saint" if you will. This is the kind of man Mordechai Vanunu—who converted to Christianity—is.

All of us can look upon Mordechai Vanunu as a role model. And that's why I have continued to fight the good fight—here and abroad—with like-minded patriots who know that what my Japanese friend, Ryu Ohta, called "the final battle" will ultimately be won. But there are—and will be—difficult times ahead. It's a struggle—but not a never-ending one.

Right now the New World Order forces are charging forward against the Muslim world and exploiting concerns (particularly in Western Europe) on the part of nationalists who believe that it's time to limit all immigration from elsewhere (not just from the Muslim world) into their countries. And, unfortunately, some of these nationalist elements have been cajoled by certain of their so-called "leaders" into not just simply criticizing immigration, but, instead, attacking Islam (as a faith) and the Muslim people in general.

Even more shocking is the fact that some so-called "nationalist leaders" in Europe—in England, France and the Netherlands, among other places—have even gone so far as to publicly ally with Israel, entering into a proverbial "pact with the devil" that places those nationalist movements in league with the very nation that represents the international force that threatens not only Western Civilization but the interests of all independent nations and peoples worldwide.

In the next chapter we will examine the war against Islam in much further detail. It is central to the New World Order's assault on mankind.

Jewish Terrorism's Ugly Record . . .

The Labour prime minister Clement Attlee was warned by MI5 that Jewish extremists planned an IRA-style terror campaign in Britain, according to secret files made public today (May 22, 2003). MI5 warned that "special reference" had been made to the then foreign secretary Ernest Bevin as a possible assassination target by militant Zionists pressing for a Jewish state in Palestine. The files . . . reveal that police also broke up what they believed was an attempt by Jewish terrorists to drop high explosives on London using war surplus aircraft.

—**"Attlee warned over Jewish terror"**
The Scotsman, May 22, 2003

Former [Israeli] prime minister Menachem Begin played a central role in a failed attempt to assassinate then-West German chancellor Konrad Adenauer, with the objective of sabotaging the reparations agreement in the works with Israel, according to the journal of Eliezer Sudit, one of the men who carried out the attempted hit. . . . Excerpts from the diary . . . reveal that Begin knew of the plans to assassinate Adenauer, and even initiated meetings to promote the operation.

—**"Begin played central role in attempt to kill Adenauer"**
The Israeli newspaper, Ha'aretz, June 13, 2006

Newly released documents contain a claim the 1976 rescue [by Israel] of hostages, kidnapped on an Air France flight and held in Entebbe in Uganda, was not all it seemed. A UK government file on the crisis . . . contains a claim Israel itself was behind the hijacking. An unnamed contact . . . told a British diplomat in Paris [D. H. Colvin] that the Israeli Secret Service, the Shin Bet, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) collaborated to seize the plane. . . .

In the document . . . Colvin writes: "According to his information, the hijack was the work of the PFLP, with help from the Israeli Secret Service, the Shin Beit. The operation was designed to . . . prevent what they see as a growing rapprochement between the PLO and the Americans . . . My contact said the PFLP had attracted all sorts of wild elements, some of whom had been planted by the Israelis." . . . The file does not make it clear how seriously the government took the claim Israel also may have aided the hijackers.

—**"Israel hijack role 'was queried'"**
BBC News, June 6, 2007

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

Reaching Out to the Muslim World in the Face of Jewish Global Intrigue

In June of 2006 I had the pleasure of spending nearly an entire month in the Islamic Republic of Malaysia (my second visit there) where I participated as a guest of Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, the longtime former prime minister of Malaysia, in the second formal session of the Perdana Global Peace Organization founded by Dr. Mahathir. During that same visit I was also a featured speaker at the International Islamic Fair held in Kuala Lumpur, the capital of Malaysia.

What follows is the prepared text of my remarks at the Islamic fair reflecting upon the power politics directing American views and policies toward the people of the Islamic world. The theme underlying my remarks was that if enough Americans came to realize the pernicious nature of Zionist power that there would indeed be a change in American political affairs and consequently in U.S. foreign policy . . .

To understand the current state of world affairs, it is critical to understand the origins of the aggressive stance by the United States toward the Islamic world.

To understand the origins of the aggressive stance by the United States toward the Islamic world, it is critical to understand that Zionist power in America dictates that stance.

To understand the nature of Zionist power in America, it is critical to understand how and why Zionist power emerged to become so pivotal in dictating American foreign policy.

Although many people in the Muslim world do recognize the major influence of Zionism in dictating U.S. foreign policy, most Muslims have no substantial knowledge of the specific historical facts that have led to the rise of Zionist power in America.

In stark contrast, few Americans—in proportion to the numbers of informed people in the Muslim world—are cognizant of Zionist power in America.

In the Muslim world it is correctly recognized that Zionist influence in America stems from significant Zionist power over the American mass media. Again—in notably stark contrast—few of my fellow Americans understand this phenomenon.

While the Zionist-influenced mass media continues to propagate the myth that there is no inordinate role played by Zionism in influencing U.S. foreign policy and that information and belief about Zionist power is based strictly on a document known as "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion," nothing could be further from the truth.

Instead, information and belief about Zionist power is based on fully accessible material that comes from pro-Zionist sources, most especially books, newspapers and magazines originating from Jewish authors and from within the American Jewish community.

As a journalist it has been my effort to inform both my fellow Americans (and all peoples, particularly in the Muslim world) not only how powerful the Zionist network is, but how it achieved that power.

My work has been strictly secular—not based on either religious or philosophical interpretation. The studies I have published rely largely on facts appearing in what are referred to as “mainstream” publications.

In fact, much of what I have published has been based on information coming from pro-Zionist authors writing in pro-Zionist books and newspapers that do not generally circulate among non-Zionist circles.

I believe my three major published works are veritable textbooks that can be used within the Muslim world to bring a solid and factual understanding of the nature of Zionist power in America and its history.

Final Judgment: The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy explains the history of the conflict between President John F. Kennedy and the state of Israel over JFK's determined effort to prevent Israel from building an arsenal of nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

Not only does the book document (using primarily Jewish sources) that JFK was involved in a bitter behind the scenes war with Israel over nuclear weapons—a point absent from all other literature on the JFK assassination until the release of *Final Judgment*—but that there is also solid evidence tying many persons (often linked in other literature to the JFK assassination) to Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad.

The details in favor of this thesis, tying Israeli intelligence to the assassination of President Kennedy, in collaboration with pro-Israel elements in the CIA and American organized crime, are immense.

What is beyond question (and what is little known to Americans, in particular, even to this day) is that upon the assassination of President Kennedy, U.S. foreign policy toward Israel (and the Arab world) did a 180 degree turnabout.

U.S. opposition to Israel's nuclear weapons program ceased and the United States began massive and unprecedented transfers of military and economic aid to the state of Israel, such that

(a) a theretofore non-existent “special relationship” emerged between the United States and Israel; and

(b) the Zionist lobby in Washington evolved, as a consequence of JFK's death, into a major force in dictating U.S. foreign policy, then (as now) virtually unchallenged in the wake of the public execution of John F. Kennedy.

In short, it was the assassination of President Kennedy that was critical to cementing the pivotal role of the Zionist lobby in America. Although Jewish influence in American economic and financial affairs in the United States had long been substantial, the issue of U.S. support for Israel was thoroughly welded into place with the murder of JFK.

This is a historical fact that must be understood and widely disseminated, particularly to Americans, in order that they come to recognize the pernicious methods used by the Zionists to achieve their power. And as a consequence of growing understanding, Americans may feel more free to look less kindly upon Zionist power in their nation.

My second work, *The High Priests of War*, is based upon some 20 years of research and critical review of the operations of the hard-line Zionist “neo-conservatives.” Although the identity and ideology of the neo-conservatives is now known worldwide, in the initial period of the early 1980s, I was one of the few journalists focusing on their intrigues.

This new volume is a concise and un-censored account of the history of the neo-conservatives and their long-standing desire to use the military might of the United States to establish a global empire—a world imperium, often called “The New World Order”—under their control, an American hegemony dominated by Zionist interests well-entrenched within the American spheres of influence.

In this regard, we refer to my third work, *The New Jerusalem: Zionist Power in America*. This candid exposition—based almost exclusively on pro-Zionist and Jewish sources—outlines the specifics of Zionist domination of the American system in multiple arenas, ranging from the economic, cultural, academic and financial, all of which leads consequently to substantial political and electoral influence far beyond the actual numbers of the Jewish population in America. Although many people worldwide are well aware of substantial Zionist influence over the American mass media, few are aware of Zionist domination of other areas of power within the American system.

What is singularly important to understand is that while Israel remains a spiritual and religious locus for the Zionist cause, the United States has become the engine of Zionist military and financial influence on the global stage. The Zionist cause has essentially adapted the United States as “The New Jerusalem” and is increasingly relying upon American military might (and the blood of Americans) to expand its power.

The Zionists now proclaim that anyone who is “anti-Zionist” or “anti-Israel” is thus necessarily also automatically “anti-American.” Americans need to know that this is not the truth.

Provoked by lies and myths and misinformation and disinformation generated by the Zionist-dominated media in America, American citizens

are becoming increasingly inclined to hate others—particularly Muslims—because they are told that “They hate us.”

To achieve peace and justice in the world today, it is vital that:

1. Peoples around the globe, particularly in the Muslim world, recognize that despite American ignorance of Zionist power, most Americans would reject the misdirection of U.S. foreign policy by Zionism if they (the Americans) had the opportunity to learn the facts about Zionist power.

2. Americans finally come to recognize the inordinate Zionist influence and that this power is harmful not only to America but to the world as a whole.

Muslims can help break Zionist influence in America—and the dangers posed to the world as a consequence—by encouraging and supporting and working with independent American journalists and media outlets in expanding their outreach both at home and around the globe.

It is vital for the mass numbers of Americans to know the truth about Zionist power in America. It is likewise vital for the world to know that many Americans—citizens and activists within the world power that has the capacity to destroy the planet—do not share the Zionist dream of a world imperium.

Zionist power can be broken and a world can emerge in which there is an America that is no longer acting as a tool for interests that are anything but “American.”



Shown (at right) is an image of a statue of the Virgin Mary which an Israeli Army tank fired upon on March 14, 2002. The hated statue stood high above the Roman Catholic Holy Family Hospital and Orphanage in Jerusalem adjacent to a Vatican flag. The Israelis fired on the statue at close range. Not an accident, it was an act of hatred reflecting traditional Jewish hostility to Christian sites in the Holy Land. At left, the Virgin's face. Muslims would never desecrate an image of Christ or of the Virgin Mary—both of whom are revered in Islam.

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

How A U.S. Ambassador Engaged in a Criminal Conspiracy to Suppress Distribution of the Writings of Michael Collins Piper

During my visit to Malaysia in 2006—my second visit there—I was astounded to learn—from two very highly-placed Malaysian political figures—that the U.S. Ambassador to Malaysia (ostensibly “my” ambassador) had sought to bribe at least one Malaysian bookshop owner and at least one Malaysian publishing company not to distribute my books. What follows is my open letter (dated June 30, 2006) to that ambassador, Christopher J. LaFleur, who, by his actions, violated both Malaysian law and U.S. law:

As you are probably aware, the matters discussed in this letter were already brought to the attention of Mr. Matthew Cenzer of the Malaysian affairs desk of the U.S. State Department in Washington, D.C. in a telephonic conference on or about June 29.

I am confident several government agencies have recordings of that, so you may feel free to refer to those recordings if you need information not referenced herein.

In addition, on June 27, in a live broadcast of my nightly radio talk forum, I described the events outlined in this letter.

For the record, however, I am directing this matter to your attention in this letter (which will also be published online at americanfreepress.net and in the pages of *American Free Press* newspaper, whose readers will find this information interesting).

During my recent visit to Malaysia (June 5-June 26), my second visit in the last two years, I was astounded to learn from two former high-ranking and very well known Malaysian government officials (both of whom I know and trust implicitly) that a person described as “the U.S. ambassador to Malaysia” approached two different private entrepreneurs in Malaysia—a bookshop owner and a publisher of my books in Malaysia—and offered them bribes to stop distributing my books *Final Judgment*, *The High Priests of War*, and *The New Jerusalem*.

It is my understanding that the person said to be “the U.S. ambassador to Malaysia” did indeed offer such a gratuity under such circumstances to either or both of these individuals, this is a crime, not only under U.S. federal law, but, according to a source in Malaysia, an attorney, it is also a crime under Malaysian law.

So I feel comfortable in asserting that the person said to be “the U.S. ambassador to Malaysia” who reportedly offered these bribes is corrupt,

that this individual is a criminal, that this individual should not be pretending to "serve" the interests of America or of any American citizen traveling in Malaysia.

In addition, under U.S. law (and also under Malaysian law), I would personally have grounds to bring a civil action against the person responsible for this malicious attempt to interfere with the commercial distribution of my books.

It is my understanding that the person said to be "the U.S. ambassador to Malaysia" demanded to know of the bookstore owner and the book publisher "why" they were distributing the books and offered to "meet [their] price" only to be told by both that neither made much money on the books and that their purpose in distributing the books was because they believed the books contained important messages they felt needed to be heard in Malaysia.

The books in question—and as you are certainly aware—are described as "controversial" because of the theses they put forth:

- *Final Judgment* asserts that the intelligence service of Israel played a role in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in response to JFK's efforts to prevent Israel from building nuclear weapons of mass destruction;

- *The High Priests of War*, an accounting of the rise to power of the fanatical pro-Israel "neo-conservative" armchair war-hawks who used their influence to direct the United States, under Young Bush, to launch a needless, destructive war against Iraq to satisfy the demands of Israel (and who are now plotting similar aggression against Iran and other states perceived to be harmful to Israel and international Zionism); and

- *The New Jerusalem*, the first-ever up-to-date accounting, in this 21st century, of the vast power and influence in the American arena by the handful of families who are the prime movers behind the Zionist lobby in the United States today.

It's rather ironic, Mr. LeFleur, that a U.S. Ambassador would try to stop distribution of these books, considering the fact that a former high-ranking State Department official has written what is undeniably the strongest and most forthright endorsement of *Final Judgment*.

In addition—and note this—when the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), the Zionist lobby group, tried to prevent me from lecturing about *Final Judgment* on a college campus in California some years ago, one of the persons who most publicly denounced the ADL and came to the defense of my right to lecture on campus was Col. Forest J. "Joe" Hunt.

If you don't know his name, you should. Colonel Hunt is the guy who was not only the trainer, at Quantico, but also the commander, of all of those gutsy U.S. Marines that guard United States embassies—

including yours—around the globe. That's the kind of people who have stood up in my defense, quite a different "cut" from those who are trying to sabotage me.

Since my books, in part, aim at the intrigues of the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)—a "junior" arm of the London-based Rothschild Dynasty-controlled Royal Institute of International Affairs—I understand why you personally might be offended by those books, since your official biography brags of your role as the "Cyrus Vance Fellow in Diplomatic Studies" at the CFR, of which you are a member.

Now since my books were first introduced in Malaysia in August of 2004, several months before you assumed the post of U.S. Ambassador, I will be the first to acknowledge that it is entirely conceivable that it was the other individual who served as ambassador, prior to you, who committed this crime.

But if you are here to deny that it was either you or the former ambassador or any member of the U.S. Embassy staff (acting on behalf of the ambassadors or on their own) who was responsible for this crime, then it is your responsibility to find out who was then posing as "the U.S. ambassador to Malaysia" in offering the bribe.

Indeed, is it possible that a U.S. Embassy staffer, posing as "the Ambassador" or pretending to act "on behalf of the U.S. Ambassador" carried out this crime on his own and was never directed by you or the other ambassador to commit this crime? If so, you should investigate.

Is it possible that the staffer was acting at the direction of a call from the White House, perhaps from I. Lewis Libby, former chief of staff for Vice President Dick Cheney, now under criminal indictment for behind-the-scenes mischief, trying to undermine another individual for political reasons, similar to the effort against me?

It is possible, in the alternative, that the staffer was acting at the direction of some American Israeli lobby figure, such as Abe Foxman of the ADL, or Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Center or perhaps the two former officials of American Israel Public Affairs Committee who are now under criminal indictment for illicit receipt of U.S. intelligence data (in other words, espionage)?

In that realm, is it possible that the bribe money was being provided by one of these Israeli lobby groups or from some source such as billionaires Edgar Bronfman or S. I. Newhouse or some other known financial supporter of Israel and the intrigues of the Israeli lobby?

Are American embassy officials offering bribes to foreign corporations on behalf of private interest groups for political reasons?

These questions are posed here precisely because I don't have the answers. But I have enough information to prove beyond question that

I am clearly a target of criminal elements inside the U.S. government.

For our purposes here, the names of the bookshop owner and the publisher of my books and the names of my sources on this affair are not relevant. But you can be certain I will provide affidavits if necessary.

When I learned that "my" own "ambassador" in Malaysia was using his influence (and presumably even my own tax dollars, perhaps taken out of some "black budget" for such purposes) to interfere with the distribution of my books, my reaction was not one of anger, but horror.

Let me note that I was not particularly disturbed by any potential financial loss (minimal, if any) nor was I especially perturbed about the idea that my books would lose a reading audience.

Rather, I was shocked to know that the very individual—the U.S. ambassador—most ultimately responsible for protecting my interests, as an American citizen traveling in Malaysia—was telling Malaysians that I am considered "garbage" by my own ambassador and subject to being the target of an illicit, crooked backroom deal initiated by that ambassador, but rejected by those Malaysians who knew that what the ambassador was offering was in violation of the law, at most, and unethical and immoral at the least.

It is appropriate to note, if only in passing, that—in March of 2003—a representative of the George W. Bush administration's U.S. Embassy in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates pulled a similar "dirty trick" undermining me while I was traveling in that country, having given a speech critical of the Bush administration's insane foreign policy as directed by the pro-Israel neo-conservatives. While I was a guest of the Arab League's official think tank, the Zayed Center, funded by Abu Dhabi's ruling Zayed family, a U.S. Embassy official called the Zayed Center to complain about my appearance there.

Although this initially amused me (at the time), I soon realized that this was a direct threat to me personally while traveling on foreign soil. My own government, which proclaims its devotion to our First Amendment freedom of speech, was effectively trying to restrict my freedom of speech on foreign soil. This is detestable, but considering what took place more recently in Malaysia, it portrays a pattern of corruption by the Bush administration and those within.

These criminals have been implicated in election fraud in both the 2000 and 2004 elections and in the use of government power to harass groups—such as the NAACP—perceived to be critical of the Bush regime, and the administration has pushed through police state legislation such as the so-called "PATRIOT" act to attempt to curtail civil liberties in America. Many walk in fear of this gang of criminals and that is why I have gone on public record to let others know precisely what I

have learned about the dirty tricks operations aimed at me personally.

In closing, I will repeat to you, Mr. LaFleur, what I told Mr. Censer at the State Department in Washington:

• Although I am confident that I could win a civil action in certainly a Malaysian court (and possibly even an American court) against the individual responsible for the outrageous conduct outlined here, I do not choose to initiate such litigation.

• Although I am certain that there are many good officials and agents inside the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Justice Department who would not hesitate to take on a criminal investigation of this matter—evidenced by their wonderful efforts in pursuing such criminal slime as Lewis Libby, and those two distasteful Zionists from AIPAC, not to mention another corrupt Zionist operator, Jack Abramoff—I am not going to demand an FBI investigation.

In other words, I am letting a criminal (or criminals) get away with a crime . . .

But perhaps this public exposure of this crime will serve as a warning not to let it happen again. Back off. Next time the full force of the criminal and civil law will be brought to bear, both here and in Malaysia or wherever else appropriate, and all those responsible will be held to account under the law.

Remember: there are still good people in the American system: in the military (those generals are top notch, taking on the neo-cons as they have) and in the FBI and the Justice Department and in the CIA and the NSA and in the State Department, too. These folks are ready to root out the bad guys who are carrying out the dirty tricks operations and the war-mongering schemes of the Zionists and there are millions of Americans who are ready to rally behind them.

Needless to say, this letter to this prominent individual—who is very clearly a criminal—went unanswered.

Obviously—and sadly—when I am traveling abroad I can not expect friendly or supportive treatment from the diplomats and others who are charged with my safety. The irony, of course, is that while in Abu Dhabi and Malaysia I had more reliance on protection from the local authorities than I did from "my" government.

So this, you see, is what happens when a government—in this case, the United States—falls under the sway of Zionist Jewish political radicalism, the ugly force that holds so much influence in the United States and in so many other nations around the world.

When the Jewish domination of the American system is finally smashed, criminals such as this "American" ambassador will be hanged.

Jesus Christ—Revered by Muslims . . .

The Jewish-controlled media in the West perpetuates the lie that Muslims hate Jesus Christ and Christians. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth. This Hellish defamation of Muslims is designed to stoke up further wars against the Arab and Muslim peoples in the name of "Americanism."

In 2001 Harvard University Press published a remarkable volume that demonstrates, beyond question, that Islamic writings have treated Christ (and his mother Mary) with great reverence. Tarif Khalidi's *The Muslim Jesus: Sayings and Stories in Islamic Literature*, is a book that should be "must" reading for every genuine Christian, for it proves the phrase "Islam-Christianity" is far more accurate than the thoroughly fraudulent term "Judeo-Christianity."

The following review of Khalidi's book, posted online at amazon.com, assesses this important volume every sincere Christian needs to know about . . .

As an Arab Christian who has lived in an Islamic environment, I have always known that Muslims cherished and respected Jesus as one of their prophets, but little did I know about the actual sayings they ascribe to him. I was therefore intrigued by the topic of this book: What do Muslims really think about Jesus, and how does their conception differ from ours? . . .

This is the first collection in English of all the sayings in early Islamic literature attributed to Jesus. Thus they are the authoritative guide to what Islam knows and thinks about Jesus. . . . While reflecting the certain theological differences between the Islamic Jesus and the Christian Jesus, these sayings are evidence for a surprising similarity in attitude and values between the two religions. . . .

This book demonstrates how Islam evolved dynamically over its first few centuries, much like how early Christianity was an evolving religion. We see how various factions of Islam competed and had their own concepts of what the religion should be, and "used" lore from prophetic figures such as Jesus to strengthen their arguments.

This whole concept of an evolving religion throws great doubts upon the ideals of modern-day "fundamentalists" who apparently wish to recreate "early Islam."

By exposing the myriad differences between Muslims themselves, and the closeness of some important Islamic elements to Christianity, *The Muslim Jesus* also throws a lot of doubt on some Westerners today who somehow feel threatened by Islam and lump all Muslims together as "enemies of Christianity."

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

What Really Happened in Iran . . . A First-Person Account of the Historic Global Conference on the Holocaust

Take this for what it's worth: what you may have heard on television or radio or read in your daily newspaper about the now-infamous international conference on the Holocaust in Iran is largely untrue, or, at the very least, seriously distorted and very much misrepresented.

In some respects, the conference was largely painted as a rally of anti-Semites, white racists, and Muslim extremists, when nothing could be further from the truth.

Instead, the conference—which included some 67 invited researchers from 30 different countries—was a diverse and eclectic gathering which not only featured a group of anti-Zionist Orthodox Jewish rabbis but also included Black speakers from the African continent, as well as Palestinian Muslim attendees and European academics who insisted that the Holocaust, as it is popularly remembered, did happen, that it was a major tragedy in which many millions of Jews were deliberately exterminated.

Thus, the false image presented by the media—that the conference was some sort of "hatefest," dedicated entirely to the proposition of what has been called "Holocaust denial"—is anything but the truth.

Thus, if anything, the tone of the conference itself was one of genuine open debate and freedom of expression, perhaps the first time ever in modern history that an international gathering actually addressed literally "all" sides of the controversy surrounding the events referred to as "the Holocaust."

So the truth is that there were many very different points of view being expressed at the conference, and they were hardly in agreement on any particular issue except for one possible general area of convergence: the concept that the Holocaust has been used as a political tool to steal 8,019 square miles of Palestine for the Zionist scheme to eventually take over the entire Mideast.

In addition, however, there were many speakers—including voices from the Arab and Muslim world—who put forth the notion that it is the United States and Britain, as imperial powers, that are more so to blame for the dislocation of the Palestinian Christians and Muslims of the Middle East—rather than Israel itself.

Israel, these speakers said—and there were many reflecting this point of view—was not the problem, per se, but rather the guilty parties responsible for the ongoing crisis in Palestine are the imperial American

and British powers that brought Israel into being as an outpost for their geopolitical designs in the region.

Many took the position that the basic story of the Holocaust, as it has been told in the media, was essentially what happened, but that whatever happened—to whatever degree—did not justify Israel's ongoing treatment of the Palestinian people.

One speaker in particular broke the basic mold of the conference. That was Lady Michele Renouf of Britain. Acknowledging the potentially inflammatory nature of her remarks, Lady Renouf suggested that the root of the modern day conflicts between Jewish people and the people of Palestine has more historic antecedents, going back through the centuries.

Lady Renouf asserted that the often hateful (and indeed racist) attitudes toward non-Jews expressed in the Jewish religious reflections in the collective works known as the Talmud were the root of much opposition to Jewish people in the nations of the West. This in itself, she said, could be partial explanation for the foundational concerns of so many Europeans who supported measures taken by the National Socialist regime of Adolf Hitler to curtail the influence of the Jews of Europe before and during World War II.

Although the Western media relished pointing out that controversial American author, Dr. David Duke, who has been teaching political science in recent years at a prestigious private university in Kiev, Ukraine, was among the speakers—always harkening back to the already well-known fact that 30 years ago Duke was involved in the Ku Klux Klan—Duke was no more “featured” as a speaker than any of the wide-ranging number of speakers from around the globe, people of all races, creeds and colors.

And for the record, it should be noted, as noted later in this report, the mass media actually distorted what the articulate Duke really did say, literally putting words (and propositions) in his mouth that Duke never uttered once during his remarks to the conference.

Duke's emphasis was not focused on the truth—or the lies—about the Holocaust, rather instead on the need for all nations to recognize and support freedom of speech and thought, no matter what the issue, no matter what special interest group might have the intention of dictating what can or can not be discussed about a particular subject.

So again, the mass media version of events was once again entirely off the mark of reality. It was, instead, a mass of lies. And it is to Duke's credit that he took advantage of the mass media's focus on his attendance at the conference to correct the record for those who care to know the truth.

In the end, given the many differences of opinion among those who lectured and attended the conference, what was probably the most profound result (and perhaps the original aim itself) of this momentous gathering was the very fact that this conference directly challenged perhaps the most hallowed icon of modern history, the Holocaust, and made clear and enunciated in no uncertain terms the basic principle that there can be no restrictions (by any single nation or ethnic group) on the discussion of historical events as those who have controlled the discussion of the Holocaust insist there must be.

That the conference was actually sponsored by the Institute for Political and International Studies, a division of the foreign ministry of the Islamic Republic of Iran, was momentous indeed: this was the first time that any government since World War II dared to acknowledge the fact that there are serious questions being raised about the specifics of the Holocaust.

But the truth is that, since the end of World War II, there have been countless (and often unsung) historians and researchers who have diligently devoted their resources (often at risk to life and limb) to ferreting out the truth. Those relentless truth-seekers have been subjected to an unending campaign of hatred by the mass media, but with the advent of this conference the international media—as a whole—was forced to acknowledge their work, however grudgingly it may have been.

Great credit must be given to Dr. Fredrick Toben, often called the “international ambassador” of the Holocaust revisionist movement, for his singularly instrumental role in helping the Iranian sponsors of the conference bring the gathering to fruition.

Although Willis A. Carto, the publisher of the world's most-widely-circulated revisionist magazine, *The Barnes Review*—6,500 subscribers strong—did not attend the conference, he took great satisfaction in seeing the Iran conference materialize as it did. When this reporter, who is on the editorial board of *The Barnes Review*, took the podium at the Iran conference, I extended Carto's best wishes to the conference.

Beyond dispute the pioneer publicist of Holocaust revisionism, responsible for the publication of hundreds of books and research papers on the topic, many of which have been translated into multiple foreign languages, thereby laying the groundwork for a burgeoning global Holocaust revisionist movement, Carto told *American Free Press*: “The Holocaust giant has feet of clay. The myth can only be sustained by suppressing the truth. But the people of the world want the truth—or at least unfettered access to the facts. What will they do now—lock up the world? Too late! Their giant is crumbling.”

As noted previously, mass media reports in the West (in the United

States in particular) often focused largely on the fact that one of the vast array of speakers at the Holocaust conference in Tehran was David Duke. Although the media repeated, *ad nauseum*, to the point of boredom, the well-known fact that in his younger days, Duke was the leader of a Ku Klux Klan group, the media failed to point out that Duke left the Klan some 30 years ago and that many of Duke's fellow speakers in Iran were people of color from Africa and Asia and throughout the Middle East. The Iran conference was hardly the so-called "white supremacist" or "racist" conclave that the American media falsely portrayed.

Nor did the media bother to mention regarding Duke that he served as a popularly elected Republican state representative from a suburban district in Louisiana and that he ran two widely publicized campaigns for governor and United States senator (winning roughly 65-70% of the European-American vote statewide both times). Nor did the media bother to mention that Duke is a certified academic, holding a Ph.D. from a prestigious private university, and that he has taught political science courses at the university level.

Highly articulate and telegenic and a longtime and open critic of imbalanced U.S. policies in support of Israel, Duke has never particularly focused on what might be called "the Holocaust issue." However, Duke is certainly familiar with the controversy and has often spoken critically of laws in European countries—where Duke spends much of his time researching and writing and lecturing—that impose prison sentences on those who dare to question details surrounding the subject of "the Holocaust." And that's what Duke focused on when he spoke in Iran.

Nonetheless, the Western media reports about Duke's speech completely misrepresented not only the whole tone of the Holocaust conference in Tehran but the actual words spoken by the former Louisiana congressman himself.

I was with Duke at the time Duke fired off this corrective message (posted on Duke's website at www.DavidDuke.com) that exposed how very much the mass media was lying about the conference. In my estimation, Duke's assessment is probably as succinct and as accurate as anything that has been or can be said about the conference and the way the media distorted the truth.

Duke pulls no punches. If you are sensitive to no nonsense language regarding the media, please read no further. However, if you are interested in truth, here's what Duke said about the media's misinformation:

It is being reported around the world that in my speech in Tehran that I stated that the 'gas chambers did not exist.' I said no such thing! In fact I said specifically that I take no position

on that issue but that I believe in freedom of speech and find it an outrage that men such as [historian] David Irving are in prison for simply voicing an intellectual, historical opinion.

The Zionist-influenced media has maintained that the purpose of the conference was to deny the Holocaust—when the actual, stated purpose was to provide free speech on this important historical issue and to protest against the suppression of free speech in some European and North American countries. The record of the conference is clear. There were many speeches at the conference that maintained the mainstream Holocaust view.

In an act of blatant deception, the Zionist-influenced media has headlined that in the closing session Iran's President called for 'wiping Israel off the map,' suggesting that he advocated a genocide or destruction of the people of Israel.

One more big lie.

Any tape or transcript of his speech will show that he said support around the world for Zionism is dwindling and that the Zionist Regime will be replaced by a democratic state in the same fashion that the Soviet Regime was dissolved in Russia.

He specifically advocated complete civil and political rights for all residents of the region, and specifically mentioned protection for the complete civil rights for Jews and Palestinians alike, and he repeatedly stressed that all peoples should love and respect one another and must disavow violence and war.

How the Zionist media lies! Thank God we have an Internet where people can immediately learn the truth. Ten years ago these lies could be stated with no fear of contradiction, now you can hear with your own ears the truth rather than the lies of a pro-Israel media.

The truth is that the Zionists are trying to create a catastrophic, murderous war with Iran so they are trying to stoke the fires of misunderstanding and hatred toward that country.

Any fair-minded person who reads my actual words and the words of the academics at the conference and the words of the Iranian President can see for themselves that the media has made up colossal lies about this conference and its participants.

Tony Blair and George Bush have called the Holocaust Conference 'disgraceful.' Why is it disgraceful to allow freedom of speech on historical issues? Isn't the real disgrace that thousands of Europeans have been imprisoned for simply questioning small details of the historical period called the "Holocaust"?

Why is a conference dedicated to free speech condemned, yet putting people in prison in Europe for exercising free speech is praised? Who are the real deniers of freedom? Aren't they the Zionist puppets Bush and Blair and the Zionist controlled media that lie about this conference, my speech, the speech of the Iranian President and those who support imprisonment of human beings for free speech?

In the wake of the Holocaust conference there came the good news that an appeals judge ordered best-selling British historian David Irving freed from imprisonment in Austria, after serving a 13 month term for the "crime" of Holocaust denial—despite the Austrian government's demand that Irving serve a full ten year sentence.

However, there was also some bad news for Holocaust revisionists. Proving precisely that those who dare to engage in genuine debate about the circumstances surrounding the Holocaust are subject to harassment, boycott and intimidation, news reports indicated that at least four individuals who attended the conference in Iran came under serious fire, at least one of them facing possible criminal prosecution.

ITEM: In Manchester, England a screaming mob attacked the home of Rabbi Ahron Cohen, one of the spokesmen for the anti-Zionist Orthodox Jewish group, Neturei Karta, which was prominently publicized in the media for its participation in the conference. The rabbi was loudly and formally shunned by the Jewish community in which he lives and Jewish leaders vowed to deny him a Jewish burial. Eggs were pelted on his home.

The irony of the abuse to which Cohen was subjected is that Cohen strenuously insisted—in opposition to the views of many at the conference—that many millions of Jews died in the Holocaust, noting that many of his own family disappeared during World War II.

ITEM: In France, President Jacques Chirac ordered an official "investigation" into the remarks made by Professor Robert Faurisson during his appearance at the conference in Iran. The inquiry would determine whether Faurisson's statements (made on Iranian soil) can be prosecuted under a 1990 French law that makes questioning details of the Holocaust a crime. According to an enthusiastic Associated Press report hailing the attack on Faurisson, the French were implying that if Faurisson's statements were published on the Internet or in a newspaper distributed in France that Faurisson would thus be liable for what he said in Iran and that some other news source distributed.

That's the essence of "freedom of speech" and "liberty" in one of the "great democracies of the West." (No prosecution took place, however)

ITEM: In Canada, at St. Francis Xavier University in Nova Scotia, political science professor Shiraz Dossa was under fire for speaking at the conference even though Dossa himself is a Holocaust believer and even said that the conference "was unfortunately stained by the presence of a small number of Holocaust deniers." Dossa spoke on the issue of how the Holocaust—which he accepts as being precisely what it is described in standard Western texts—has been manipulated in the war on terror. Dossa has been called on the carpet by university authorities, subjected to media defamation, targeted by angry letters from other academics and the question of his continuing university tenure has been raised.

ITEM: In Sweden, Jan Bernhoff, who spoke at the conference in Tehran, was suspended from his job as a computer science teacher at an adult education college because he lectured in Tehran. Although his job as a computer teacher has nothing whatsoever to do with history or the Holocaust, the action against him was taken. According to press reports, a "probe" of Bernhoff by the school is now under way.

The primary complaint against Bernhoff's lecture seems to be the fact that he said that, based upon his research and that of others, the allegation that 6,000,000 Jews died during World War II cannot be backed up by factual data and that the figure is considerably less than that. Even arguing with the figure of "Six Million" is thus considered "Holocaust denial" and even young Bernhoff's attendance at the conference was "unacceptable," as the Swedish cabinet's Minister for Schools, Jan Bjorkland, self-righteously declared.

ITEM: The so-called Forum of Jewish Organizations in Antwerp, Belgium filed a lawsuit in Belgium—where "Holocaust denial" is punishable by a year in jail—against all of the speakers at the Iran conference (including yours truly). The purpose was to make trouble for those of us who might wish to visit Belgium in the future, but *I have no desire to visit a police state where questioning the Holocaust is illegal.*

What further fall-out from the conference there will be remains to be seen but the bottom line is that the war against freedom of expression in regard to this issue is far from over. But Holocaust revisionism, by virtue of its stand in favor of intellectual freedom, continues to stand on the side of the angels, its brutal and vicious enemies notwithstanding.

Among the many speakers at the conference was my good friend, Malaysian diplomat and attorney, Matthias Chang, the author of *Future FastForward* and *Brainwashed for War* (and later, *The Shadow Money Lenders*). In his address, entitled "The Zionists' Insidious Benchmark for War Atrocities," Chang expressed the view of many people around the world that it's time to end the Jewish monopoly on suffering. What follows are excerpts from Chang's highly significant remarks:

Why talk about death and the horrors of a war that happened 60 years ago, when right at this moment, wanton destruction and massacres of the innocents are taking place in Iraq, Palestine, Lebanon and in many parts of Africa?

Why indeed! It has been said that the first casualty of war is truth. As such we must be especially careful when reviewing history written by the victors and losers in war.

We must not partake in the perpetuation of lies and propaganda that serve vested interests.

The killings of the Jews cannot and must not be distinguished from the war crimes committed by all war criminals against all the victims of the Second World War. The German citizens who were incinerated by fire-bombs and the Japanese of Hiroshima and Nagasaki who were vaporized by nuclear bombs are as much victims as the Jews. They were all victims of WWII.

Those who continue to promote the political line that the Holocaust is a unique and an exceptional Jewish historical event, when compared to the sufferings of the other victims, such as the Chinese who were slaughtered in excess of 10 million, have to that extent minimized the atrocities committed by both sides in WWII. It is an attempt to white-wash the war crimes of the victors in WWII.

The Holocaust is now being used as a benchmark by which all other atrocities are judged, such that when the full horror of the devastation in Iraq was exposed, the international media contemptuously dismissed the war crimes committed against the Iraqi people as the price of establishing democracy. The same goes for the Palestinians.

No one race or community should be allowed to arrogate to itself and or demand exclusive memorials to their sufferings. The right to survive cannot be monopolized by one race or community. To accept that the Holocaust was an exceptional Jewish historical event is to deny the genocides, massacres and sufferings inflicted on the rest of mankind throughout history. This cannot be right.

I cannot help but question the motives of those who seek to elevate the sufferings of the Jewish people above those who had suffered as much, if not more from the horrors of WWII. And when the sufferings of the Jewish people have turned into an industry we owe a moral duty to the departed to ensure that no one should profit from blood money, more so, when lies are perpetrated to further such profiteering.

If we are gathered here to seek truth and to condemn war crimes, then we must condemn all war crimes, not just those allegedly committed by the defeated in WWII. If we judge Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo as war criminals, then we cannot but find Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin guilty as well.

We must set up an International Commission of Jurists to review the findings of the Nuremberg Military Tribunal.

We must set up a War Crimes Tribunal to adjudicate on the crimes of all Allied Powers leaders during WWII.

We must set up a War Crimes Tribunal to adjudicate on the war crimes of all Zionist leaders, specifically the past and present leaders of the state of Israel.

Prominently on display at the international conference on the Holocaust were a number of video documentaries by an American filmmaker whose productions provide—for the first time ever—a fascinating look at little-known facts (and a deconstruction of the myths) about the Holocaust and the problems of the Middle East stemming from the establishment of the state of Israel which the media often tells us “rose from the ashes of the Holocaust.”

Although you’ve never heard of him, unlike the names of the big Hollywood filmmakers, Mark Farrell is one of the most talented young filmmakers today. And you can bet your live savings that none of Farrell’s documentaries will ever be nominated for an Academy Award, unlike the many Holocaust documentaries by Rabbi Marvin Hier of the Simon Wiesenthal Center which are always up for the Oscar—and win.

The reason, of course, is simple: Farrell’s films—which have not received the distribution they deserve—address some of the most controversial topics on the face of the planet today.

Although Farrell has no billionaire families promoting him, he has utilized his considerable talents to produce a variety of DVD documentaries that are “must” viewing for those interested in historical revelations that can’t be found on any other videos.

Farrell’s videos on the explosive topic of the Holocaust and the questions raised about that subject, much to the dismay of those who want to maintain a monopoly on what can—and cannot—be said about it should be noted first:

- *The Persecution of Revisionists: The Holocaust Unveiled.* Although there has been a lot in the news about the jailing of top-notch revisionist historians (which Farrell examines in overview), this video is particularly powerful in that it contains actual film footage taken inside World War II concentration camps that has been suppressed by the mass

media which prefers to relentlessly depict images of stacks of dead bodies (most of which, in fact, were filmed post-war at two camps on German soil—Dachau and Buchenwald—where even professional “Nazi-hunters” admit no gas chambers were ever used to kill anybody).

• *Judea Declares War: A Critical Look at World War II.* While many have heard the official rendition of the causes of the conflagration that ripped the world apart, this video presents a refreshing look at “the other side of the coin.” If Farrell presented this video in Germany today, he would most certainly be sent to prison.

Farrell has also produced a number of other classic high-quality DVDs on other “taboo” issues including race relations and several that are candid presentations related to the Middle East controversy:

• *Understanding Anti-Semitism.* A forthright look at a 3,000-year-old phenomenon that is much-discussed but seldom analyzed, explaining the reasons behind the growing discontent with the power of organized Zionist groups in America and around the world;

• *Rep. Paul Findley Dares to Speak Out.* A fascinating interview with the longtime congressman driven out of office by the Israeli lobby for daring to criticize U.S. support for Israel. Here’s Findley’s first-hand un-censored account;

• *Zionist War Crimes: The Case for the Prosecution.* Here’s the historic record—going back to even before the founding of Israel—regarding Zionist terrorism, featuring rare film footage from the Middle East, exposing Israeli “statesmen” as ruthless terrorist butchers;

This is just a brief look at some of the videos Farrell has undertaken. His commentary is candid—no-holds-barred. If you are “politically correct,” you may find it tough to absorb. But if you’re not afraid of difficult subjects and want to convey to others another side of history, these videos are just what you need.

In these videos, there’s no shrieking or grandstanding or “hard sell” as all-too-frequently found in some video presentations by some “celebrities” in the alternative media today. You won’t be embarrassed to show Farrell’s videos to friends who are “on the fence” and who may need a subtle push to come around to your point of view.

But Farrell is no shrinking violet. He makes his position clear and presents it in a factual, restrained way, supplemented with an amazing variety of illustrations, film footage and other material brought to the screen in such an effective way.

The videos are fast-moving, eye-catching and certainly unrivaled by any other videos that have addressed these topics. And, it should be noted, it is hard to even name any other videos of this kind whatsoever.

And that’s what makes Farrell’s work so powerful and much need-

ed. Never before has a videographer challenged so many “treasured” historical lies and factual aberrations as Farrell has done so skillfully.

With these videos Farrell has established himself as “the” unrivaled video historian in the realm of bringing history into accord with the facts in the tradition of the late Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes and his modern-day heirs such as David Irving, Germar Rudolf, Ernst Zundel and untold thousands who are now (or who have been) consigned to prison for daring to question so-called “established” facts that are really no more than tired-and-worn repetitions of wartime propaganda and disinformation posing as historical truth.

(These videos are available at \$22 postpaid by writing: Mark Farrell, P.O. Box 141243, Dept. AFP1, Cincinnati, OH 45250-1243. Or go online to Farrell’s website at www.honestmediatoday.com for further information as well as a wealth of additional commentary and insights.)

The most important thing that I can convey about Iran in general—my most memorable reaction in retrospect—is this simple concept: Americans need to ignore anything and everything they hear about modern-day Iran, its leader, its culture, and its people from the mass media in America.

It wasn’t until I actually arrived in Tehran and spent a day or so there that it became so apparent to me that even I—who fancied myself as being reasonably well informed about that country—had come to Iran with a lot of misconceptions (prejudices, that is) that were imposed on me (and yes, it’s a type of brainwashing) by the major media in America: everything from the nightly “news” broadcasts to the feature stories and other information (largely propaganda, both subtle and not-so-subtle) in the major news magazines.

As our plane prepared to land in Tehran, a message across the loud-speaker was rather jarring. It said that “by government decree” all women were required to cover their heads upon arrival in Iran. I knew this was the case, but to actually hear it broadcast over the airplane’s public address system was, even for me, somewhat un-nerving.

The mass media’s image of oppressed women, being beaten and abused and forced to cover themselves from head to toe in dark, mysterious-looking garb, immediately came to mind. But I looked about the plane, at the array of women—Iranian and otherwise, dark-skinned, light-skinned, blonde and brunette, Eastern and Western, you name it—and I didn’t see a single one of those ladies flinch. Not even the richest looking women aboard, Iranian ladies in elegant clothes and dripping in expensive jewelry, seemed to be fazed in the least.

And it was then, as I surveyed the people aboard that plane going to Tehran (from Frankfurt, Germany, my connection point from

Washington, DC), I realized in my own mind, for the first time, that these were people who might soon be dead: innocent victims of a reign of fire from the sky (a very real Holocaust) either from American bombers or Israeli bombers or both.

These Iranian people, living their lives, traveling freely back and forth from their country to others, are in the gunsights of America's George Bush and his Zionist allies in Washington and Tel Aviv.

Those Iranians are among the people whom 1,000 American Jewish rabbis—representing, by their sheer numbers, an overwhelming proportion of the synagogue-going American Jewish community—peti-

No, They Are Not Jews or of Jewish Origin . . .



Ahmadinejad

Arafat

Qaddafi

In recent years, the Jewish-controlled mass media circulated a story suggesting Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was of Jewish extraction. Although it had no basis in fact, the story spread like wildfire and many people who were previously sympathetic to Ahmadinejad and Iran promptly began calling the Iranian president a "Zionist tool" who was trying to lead his nation to disaster. In fact, this ugly rumor was similar to previous allegations—published in Jewish newspapers—that longtime Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat and famed Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi were born to Jewish mothers. These stories—likewise—created a stir, just as they were intended to. And the point might be added that if, in fact, either of these men did happen to be of Jewish blood, that did not suggest that they were somehow "Zionist" or "Jewish" agents who had infiltrated Iran, the Palestinian cause, and Libya to do mischief.

tioned President Bush to attack, using American military resources (and risking the precious lives of American men and women) to do it. "If those rabbis, supposedly 'men of God,' want to wage war against these Iranians," I thought, "then let them do it. But they had better stop pestering Americans to fight another needless war for Israel."

The realization that these living, breathing human beings from all walks of life—these Iranians—were the targets of the wrath of those war-crazed rabbis stayed with me throughout my entire time in Iran, a great burden for me as an American, knowing that the president of the United States is more in line with the thinking of those 1,000 war-mongering "religious" leaders than he is with the vast numbers of peace-loving Americans.

Although I was in Iran—and only in the capital city of Tehran—for some five days (arriving early Sunday morning and departing early Thursday morning) and spent most of the time at my hotel and at the meeting hall for the Holocaust conference (both of which were in the northern part of that expansive, sprawling city of 14 million people), I did get the opportunity to see much of Tehran.

At the close of the conference on Tuesday evening, we were shuttled to a government center in central Tehran where we were formally greeted en masse by President Ahmadinejad, who later graciously posed for photographs and signed autographs and spoke (through translators) with the attendees who enthusiastically surrounded him to thank him for having dared to face global media assault for having convened that controversial gathering.

Later, that evening, we were taken to a banquet at the modern and functional headquarters of the Iraqi foreign ministry, high atop the city on the mountainside with a magnificent overlook of Tehran. There we had the opportunity to meet and speak personally with Iranian foreign minister Manouchehr Mottaki who hosted the dinner and there pledged continuing support for foreign political dissidents who dared to continue to speak out on the issue of the Holocaust and regarding the global influence of the Zionist power bloc.

And there on the grounds of the foreign ministry of the Islamic republic of Iran was a lighted Christmas tree. Yes, folks, Jesus Christ is revered by the Muslim people, and his birth is celebrated and honored in the capital of one of the world's most dedicated Muslim nations.

This is a point that will fluster Muslim-bashing pro-Israel Christian fundamentalists in light of their devotion to a foreign entity (Israel) that would never, under any circumstances, raise a Christmas tree and, in fact, does all it can to suppress celebrations of Christ by Christians (and Muslims) in Palestine. So there it was: a Christmas tree in Islamic Iran.

So shuttling back and forth across Tehran, we got to see the city (and its people) live, in action, so to speak. And what a busy place it is, certainly the busiest city that I've ever seen (and I've been to New York, Moscow, Tokyo and Kuala Lumpur, very busy big cities all).

No, the Iranian president did not call for Israel to be "wiped off the map" or destroyed . . .

Although the lie has been published time and again in one form or another by virtually every newspaper and magazine in America and repeated in all of the major broadcast media, never once did Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad ever call for Israel to be "wiped off the map" or otherwise destroyed.

When I was in Iran at the international Holocaust conference (described in these pages) Ahmadinejad repeated to those assembled what he had said previously (and what he said later, on other occasions): that, ultimately, the state of Israel would cease to exist as a geopolitical entity, just as the Soviet Union had come to cease to exist. The Soviet regime collapsed of its own weight and decline and new nations (many of them, in fact) emerged in its wake.

Ahmadinejad never called for war or genocide against the people of Israel. He simply predicted that—under the very real circumstances of our time—it was likely Israel would face the same fate of the communist empire. The Iranian leader added further that, in the end, Jews, Christians and Muslims alike would work together to establish a new secular democratic state in Palestine.

At those times Ahmadinejad made these remarks, only a handful of honest news sources made any effort to clarify precisely what the Iranian leader had said. In fact, a number of analysts noted that the "translations" of what Ahmadinejad had purportedly said were so clumsy, to the point even Iranian sources (translating Ahmadinejad's Farsi into English) had rendered Ahmadinejad's words inaccurately.

The big point here is that the media deliberately distorted and obfuscated and played the classic "Big Lie" game that Adolf Hitler quite accurately attributed to traditional propaganda emanating from Jewish sources. It was central to the ongoing effort to stir up hatred against Iran, perpetuating for the Christian world the ancient Jewish enmity toward the Persian people commemorated in the genocidal work known as the Book of Esther which celebrates the mass murder of 75,000 Persians—an accomplishment Israel apparently seeks to replicate in the opening years of the 21st Century

In general, in my personal estimation, the Iranians I met—ranging from waiters and hotel workers to diplomats and scholars—are good natured, wry in their wit, very friendly and hardly "anti-American," except perhaps for a naturally developing antipathy to George W. Bush and that small clique of his handlers and co-conspirators who want to kill the Iranian people, destroy their government, cripple their nuclear energy program, and turn their historic nation—the very land of Daniel of the Bible—into a cauldron of death and disaster as they have already done to Iraq, once a thriving republic.

Tehran is bustling, energetic, hardly the image that one would expect from the media coverage that the Western press conveys to its gullible audiences. There is no over-hanging sense of gloom in Tehran, no specter of oppression, no feeling that secret police and observation cameras are close by, monitoring one's every move. People live their lives, going to and from work, just as they do anywhere else.

Now, of course, the saloons have been shut down and certain forms of dress and decorum are expected of visitors and natives alike, but traveling through Tehran one doesn't feel any different than one might feel in any other major city.

There is one notable and striking exception to this: the fact that the traffic in Tehran is enormously overwhelming and the pedestrians and the drivers seem to have overcome the conflict and have forged a bizarre (if cooperative) way of dealing with the mess.

Thanks to the good offices (and good driving) of Iranian film-maker Nader Talebzadeh—who was one of the featured speakers at the *American Free Press/Barnes Review* free speech conference held in Washington over Labor Day weekend this past fall—I had the opportunity to get some additional travel time throughout the amazing city, during which time Talebzadeh interviewed me in his car on camera (with the city's expanse in the background) for a documentary he is making.

Through Talebzadeh I also met the talented Muslim actor who lovingly portrayed Jesus in Talebzadeh's motion picture on the last days of Christ on Earth (financed by the Iranian ministry of culture) that—by the estimation of critics who have seen advance screenings—rivals even Mel Gibson's epic *Passion of the Christ*.

These are just a few thoughts and impressions about one of the most misrepresented nations on Earth today. Much more could be said, but this gives a brief overview of some things that need to be said and understood, particularly as the Jews (and it is the Jews) push ever forward to drive the United States and the West into a war against Iran—a war that could bring, in the end, a global conflagration—a very real Holocaust—unlike anything ever seen on our planet.

**Another Holocaust Adventure:
Saying "Boo" to Deborah "Lippy" Lipstadt
Grand Pooh-Bah of the Holocaust Racket**

Although my participation in the international Holocaust conference was certainly a landmark in my career, I would be remiss in failing to note my participation in another Holocaust-related adventure, some years before that.

The circumstances, you shall see, demonstrate precisely how the Jewish arbiters of "what is and what isn't" simply have no desire to debate those who dare to question the Jewish agenda. In fact, they say there are no grounds for debate: The Jewish opinion is fact.

On July 14, 1994, widely-touted author Deborah Lipstadt faced a now-quite-memorable gauntlet when she arrived for a taxpayer-financed lecture at the National Archives in Washington, DC. Truth-tellers—including myself—were there to expose her lies and disinformation to those who were interested in hearing the facts.

Lipstadt was the author of two controversial books: *Beyond Belief*, which, in essence makes the outrageous claim that Americans didn't do enough to fight Nazi Germany during World War II—a point that will surprise many American war veterans and the survivors of those who died in that pointless war—and *Denying the Holocaust*, which purported to be the final refutation of those fact-oriented historians who had documented numerous myths and mistaken beliefs about events which took place during the period known as "The Holocaust."

Lipstadt's *Denying the Holocaust* contained numerous mis-statements of fact throughout its pages. However, most outrageous among Lipstadt's errors was her deceitful report of the momentous conclusion of the decade long legal effort by Holocaust survivor Mel Mermelstein to destroy not only the Institute for Historical Review (the historical revisionist group founded by my long-time associate Willis A. Carto) but also Liberty Lobby, the Washington-based populist institution which published *The Spotlight* weekly newspaper, by which, of course, I had long been employed through Mr. Carto's good graces.

Although by the time Lipstadt's book had gone to press, Mermelstein had been bested by Liberty Lobby's attorney Mark Lane in a dramatic courtroom encounter in Los Angeles on September 19, 1991, Lipstadt claimed in her book that the case remained in litigation.

This was simply not true. Lipstadt was a liar—an audacious, bold-faced liar. In fact, the case had long been put to rest, as documented at length in my own book on the Mermelstein case, *Best Witness*, referenced earlier in this volume.

That Lipstadt deliberately lied in her book is proven by the fact that her book went to press in the spring of 1993, almost two years after the decision in the Mermelstein case, September 19, 1991. In fact, she cited as her source an appeal brief of Mermelstein's lawyers submitted on May 4, 1992 which was rejected by the California appeals court on October 28, 1992, at least five months before her book went to press!

Thus, it was appropriate that as she stepped out of her cab outside the National Archives in Washington, Lipstadt was greeted by yours truly, Michael Collins Piper. Introducing myself in a friendly way—I don't think she recognized me or my name—I handed her a copy of *Best Witness* and told her, "This is my book. There's an entire chapter devoted to exposing you. It's entitled 'The Soap Lady.' I'm here with several of my colleagues and we'll be monitoring your lecture."

A photographer captured the classic moment on film as Lipstadt frantically held up the book in an unsuccessful attempt to block her photograph from being taken. Then Lipstadt scurried across the plaza in front of the National Archives, clutching her copy of *Best Witness*.

However, before she could enter the National Archives, Lipstadt faced another obstacle. In front of the entrance stood my delightful friend, Dr. Robert Brock, the veteran Black nationalist figure famous for his then-ongoing picking campaign outside the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum (of which Lipstadt was then a newly-appointed director).

Brock and an associate were distributing not only copies of *Best Witness* to people arriving for her lecture, but also a flyer asking: "Is Little Debbie a Big Liar? Can You Really Trust Deborah Lipstadt?". The flyer focused on Lipstadt's falsehoods about the Mermelstein case.

Dodging by Brock and company, Lipstadt rushed into the archives building and made her way to the taxpayer-supported lecture hall where she soon took position on stage. There were some 200 people in attendance, an overwhelming majority of them Lipstadt fans (and presumably, likewise, overwhelmingly Jewish Holocaust enthusiasts).

The revisionists outside had made their presence felt and Lipstadt was definitely ill at ease. As "Lippy" began her lecture, a photographer stepped forward and snapped her picture from the aisle alongside the packed hall. "No photographs," she snapped to the consternation of the young man who then stepped back and obeyed her tough command.

Then Lipstadt began—almost muttering: "The best witnesses. Who are the best witnesses to the Holocaust? Not the survivors. The best witnesses to the Holocaust are its perpetrators." She was presumably referring to the administrators of the German-run labor camp system in Europe during World War II, which administrators included many Jews, a point Holocaust promoters prefer to be forgotten.

Her choice of terminology regarding "best witnesses" was obviously influenced—dictated, really—by her receipt, just moments before, of *Best Witness*. However, by thus saying what she had said, Lipstadt had effectively repudiated her own book, *Denying the Holocaust*—subtitled "The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory"—which contends that the very memory of Holocaust survivors is sacred and beyond question.

However, before an audience of supporters, Lipstadt decided—reversing herself—that, after all, the survivors were not, in fact, the best witnesses. This, of course, could even be considered an affront to Holocaust survivor Mel Mermelstein who had described himself as the "best witness" to the Holocaust.

In the midst of her lecture, yet another photographer (who had arrived late and missed her previous admonition) snapped her picture. "No pictures!" she shouted, but this photographer wouldn't back down. "This is a public forum," he told her, no doubt surprised a publicity-seeking political propagandist would reject the opportunity to have her visage commemorated. It was even possible the young man was a Jewish believer in the Holocaust, eager to promote Miss Lipstadt's work.

However, an archives official stepped forward and announced that no pictures or recordings of this lecture would be permitted unless with the express permission of Lipstadt, who had not given such permission. At the end of the lecture, though, Lipstadt did give her consent to answer questions from the audience.

To her surprise, the first question took her to task for her mis-statements in *Denying the Holocaust* regarding the Mermelstein affair. Rising to his feet, a man in the audience said, "Since you devoted nine pages to attacking me personally, I'd like to take this opportunity to respond." The speaker held a copy of *Best Witness* in his hand.

"Who are you, sir?" asked Miss Lipstadt, obviously unnerved and clearly a bit confused. The man said, "I'm Willis Carto," and, almost instantly, there was a roaring gasp that swept across the auditorium.

As I later told Willis—the founder of the Institute for Historical Review and Liberty Lobby, a gentleman to whom Miss Lipstadt had long directed much venom—it was as if Satan himself had materialized there in that hall. They knew who he was.

Taking a moment to recover, stepping back from the microphone, her face contorted in anger, Lipstadt shouted "I have nothing to say to you. I don't debate people like you." She flamboyantly turned her head away, stepping back further as if to emphasize her point.

In fact, Carto's confrontation of Lipstadt was the first time any revisionist leader had faced her in a public forum, for Lipstadt had stoutly refused to debate any revisionist anywhere under any circumstances.

"That's right," said Carto. "You talk about fidelity to the truth but you are afraid of freedom of speech. In your book you deliberately lied about the Mel Mermelstein case. You said he won his suit against the Institute for Historical Review and Liberty Lobby, but that's not true. He lost and you know it." Carto gestured with the copy of *Best Witness* he held.

Looking around, almost desperately, for someone to rescue her with a friendly question, Lipstadt repeated: "I have nothing to say to you. Next question, please." Carto charged on, saying: "I challenge you to a debate on Mel Mermelstein or any other subject you wish."

At that point, a member of the audience screamed hysterically: "Shut up. You just shut up!" From the back of the room, I shouted "Let the man speak." Audience members turned to get a glimpse of any person who had the audacity to support Carto's right to defend himself against Lipstadt's lies, almost as if he had no right to do so.

"I'll take another question," Lipstadt shouted—hopefully. But Carto got in a final salvo: "Debbie, you're a liar."

At that dramatic juncture, a camera flashed—to "Lippy's" anger—as the moment was captured on film: The first public exposure of Lipstadt's lies before several hundred people, largely her followers. Lipstadt—so accustomed to friendly media coverage—had obviously never experienced anything like it.

Having made his point, Carto quietly stepped into the aisle and made his way up out of the lecture hall as Lipstadt clearly struggled to regain her composure. She noticeably rushed through the remaining questions from the audience.

To her dismay, however, yet another question put her on the spot. The questioner quietly asked Lipstadt why the Holocaust of World War II was the only "holocaust" that deserved the attention it was getting, this in the face of numerous other holocausts that had been taken place throughout history.

This was too much for Lipstadt. Launching into a meandering monologue that never answered the question, Lipstadt sensed that she was beaten and abruptly brought the event to a close, announcing that this was the last question she would answer.

Although she had launched her lecture bragging that she had, in fact, repeatedly refused to face her critics, she had no other choice in this very public forum financed by the American taxpayers.

So let it be said in summary: This most revealing experience once again demonstrated to me—as it should to all sensible people—that the Jewish Agenda holds precisely to the theme that *the Jewish point of view is the one and only one that can be heard*.

But the cannonade of truth will not be silenced.

America and Israel Against the World?

In the 1950s, Lawrence Dennis, America's foremost nationalist theoretician, warned against the United States alliance with Israel. His prophetic writings foreshadowed exactly the dangers of the New World Order war against Islam now being waged that Dennis predicted so long ago. Readers of the following selection from Dennis will marvel at how precise he was in noting the linguistic trickery promoting such a crusade . . .

Thanks to American meddling, the world is in a bigger mess than ever. American intervention can only be maintained with continued and increasing deployment of American force and money. The day of profitable exploitation by the white man of Africa or Asia is now over. From here on, only profitable cooperation is a rational objective. No political leader in Africa or Asia can have a better asset than to be denounced by Americans. The world minority of whites should have the brains to understand that exploiting the dynamics of hate and fear never was good business for a privileged "have" minority. The dynamics of hate and fear can only prove fatal for the minority. The white West, or the haves, are the minority.

Permanent Mideast crisis has great headline news value for policy. It is wonderful having a "colored world Hitler" nowhere so powerful as Adolf. The end result is certain. Time, numbers and space are with the colored world, with the Muslim nationalists and against Israel. What the colored world lacked has been unity and dynamism. Well, Israel is contributing to the unification and activation of the colored world for war against the outsiders. The white powers and the Israelis can never achieve ultimate and decisive force superiority over the colored world and the vast areas it populates.

However, the western world—if guided by operational rationalism and calculation instead of mystical legalism, moralism and traditionalism—could easily formulate propositions with the colored world mutually advantageous to all concerned. Only a return to [American] neutrality could ensure against our government fighting a third world war against overwhelming numerical odds. The more natives Americans kill, the better for the interests of native nationalists. The pressure will be only on the American taxpayers and conscripts for the wars of perpetual foreign intervention.

Hollywood couldn't have picked a more fitting war stage than Palestine. For the third great religious war of one lifetime, no area could be more appropriate. The staging and casting are superb. It is the chosen land of the chosen people, under the special personal care of the God of Israel. It is going to be interesting to watch American casualties pile up in the Mideast.

America's contribution to religious war in the 20th century [was] mono-diabolism [i.e. the designation of a single "devil" enemy]. Uncle Sam can never admit any imputation of sin against his allies. One "ism" has to get security clearance. The other has to be branded as subversive. It won't be long now until Judaism and Islam will be up for security rating in the permanent war. There is just one devil that is against Uncle Sam or not with him.

Is the answer: "Just the U.S. and Israel?" If it is, the cards will be heavily stacked against the third American crusade.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

Ezra Pound: Poet, Populist, Philosopher: Another of the Great "Anti-Semites"

I am often asked to define my own political philosophy. In my own futuristic novel, *My First Days in the White House*, I made a nominal effort to do that. However, in the end, I would suggest that the writings and reflections of famed American thinker Ezra Pound probably most closely mirror my own, and he, too, has ^{been} defamed as an anti-Semite.

In the following selection, originally published in *The Barnes Review*, I distilled Pound's views as he related them in his own inimitable way in his radio broadcasts from Italy during World War II. Ultimately, Pound's warnings have been proven so right. And I might add that I was privileged to have shared a friendship with the late American writer, Eustace Mullins, who was Pound's protege. Here's what Pound really had to say . . .



From 1945 through 1958 America's iconoclastic poet—the flamboyant Ezra Pound, one of the most influential individuals of his generation—was held in a Washington, D.C. mental institution, accused of treason. Pound had merely done what he had always done—spoken his mind in his own colorful, no-nonsense fashion.

Unfortunately for Pound, however, he had made the error of criticizing the American government in a series of broadcasts from Italy during World War II. For that he was made to pay the price. Here we present an in-depth over view of precisely what Pound had to say in those now-infamous broadcasts. Was Pound a traitor—or a prophet? Read his words and judge for yourself.

American students have been taught by scandalized educators that famed American poet and philosopher Ezra Pound delivered "treasonous" English-language radio broadcasts from Italy (directed to both Americans and to the British) during World War II.

However, as noted by Robert H. Walker, an editor for the Greenwood Press: "Thousands of people have heard about them, scores have been affected by them, yet but a handful has ever heard or read them."

This ignorance of Pound's most controversial political rhetoric is ironic, inasmuch as: "No other American—and only a few individuals throughout the world—has left such a strong mark on so many aspects of the 20th century: from poetry to economics, from theater to philosophy, from politics to pedagogy, from Provençal to Chinese. If Pound was not always totally accepted, at least he was unavoidably there."

One critic called Pound's broadcasts a "confused mixture of fascist apologetics, economic theory, anti-Semitism, literary judgment and memory." Another described them as "an unholy mixture of ambiguity, obscurity, inappropriate subject matters [and] vituperation," adding (grudgingly) there were "a few pearls of unexpected wisdom."

Despite all the furor over Pound's broadcasts—which were heard between January of 1941 through July of 1943—it was not until 1978 that a full-length 465-page compendium of transcriptions of the broadcasts was assembled by Prof. Leonard Doob of Yale University in association with aforementioned Greenwood Press.

Published under the title *Ezra Pound Speaking—Radio Speeches of World War II*, the volume provides the reader a comprehensive look at Pound's philosophy as it was presented by the poet himself in what Robert Walker, who wrote the foreword to the compendium, describes as "that flair for dramatic hyperbole."

What follows is an attempt to synthesize Pound's extensive verbal parries. Most of what is appears here has never been printed anywhere except in the compendium of Pound's wartime broadcasts. Thus, for the first time ever—for a popular audience—here is what Pound really had to say, not what his critics claim he said.

When he was broadcasting from Italy during wartime, Pound evidently pondered the possibility of one day compiling transcriptions of his broadcasts (or at least expected—quite correctly—that one day the transcripts would be compiled by someone else). The bombastic philosopher hoped the broadcasts would show a consistent thread once they were committed to print. And indeed they do.

Pound recognized relaying such a massive amount of information about so many seemingly unrelated subjects might be confusing listeners less widely read than he. However, the poet also had very firm ideas about the need of his listeners to be able to synthesize the broad range of material that appeared in his colorful lectures.

Pound was sure his remarks on radio were not seditious, but were strictly informational and dedicated to traditional principles of Americanism—including the Constitution, in particular. In response to media claims that he was a fascist propagandist, Pound had this to say:

If anyone takes the trouble to record and examine the series of talks I have made over this radio it will be found I have used three sorts of material: historical facts; convictions of experienced men, based on fact; and the fruits of my own experience. The facts . . . mostly antedate the fascist era and cannot be considered as improvisations trumped up to meet present

requirements. Neither can the beliefs of Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Jackson, Van Buren, and Lincoln be laughed off as mere fascist propaganda. And even my own observations date largely before the opening of the present hostilities.

I defend the particularly American, North American, United States heritage. If anybody can find anything hostile to the Constitution of the U.S.A. in these speeches, it would greatly interest me to know what. It may be bizarre, eccentric, quaint, old-fashioned of me to refer to that document, but I wish more Americans would at least read it. It is not light and easy reading but it contains several points of interest, whereby some of our present officials could, if they but would, profit greatly.

Pound's immediate concern was the war in Europe—"this war on youth—on a generation"—which he described as the natural result of the "age of the chief war pimps." He hated the very idea that Americans were being primed for war, and on the very day of Pearl Harbor he denounced the idea that American boys should soon be marching off to war: "I do not want my compatriots from the ages of 20 to 40 to go get slaughtered to keep up the Sassoon and other British Jew rackets in Singapore and in Shanghai. That is not my idea of American patriotism," he added.

In Pound's view, the American government alliance with British finance capitalism and Soviet Bolshevism was contrary to America's tradition: "Why did you take up with those gangs?" he rhetorically asked his listeners. Pound described the situation:

Two gangs. [The] Jews' gang in London, and [the] Jew murderous gang over in Moscow? Do you like Mr. Litvinov? [the Jewish-born Soviet ambassador to Britain]. Do the people from Delaware and Virginia and Connecticut and Massachusetts . . . who live in painted, neat, white houses . . . do these folks really approve [of] Mr. Litvinov and his gang, and all he stands for?

There was no reason for U.S. intervention abroad, he said:

The place to defend the American heritage is on the American continent. And no man who had any part in helping [Franklin] Delano Roosevelt get the United States into [the war] has enough sense to win anything . . . The men who wintered at Valley Forge did not suffer those months of intense cold and hunger . . . in the hope that . . . the union of the colonies would

one day be able to stir up wars between other countries in order to sell them munitions.

What was the American tradition? According to Pound:

The determination of our forbears to set up and maintain in the North American continent a government better than any other. The determination to govern ourselves internally, better than any other nation on earth. The idea of Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, to keep out of foreign shindies [fights].

Of FDR's interventionism, he declared:

To send boys from Omaha to Singapore to die for British monopoly and brutality is not the act of an American patriot.¹⁴ However, Pound said: "Don't shoot the president. I dare say he deserves worse, but . . . [a]ssassination only makes more mess.

Pound saw the American national tradition being buried by the aggressive new internationalism. According to Pound's harsh judgment:

The American gangster did not spend his time shooting women and children. He may have been misguided, but in general he spent his time fighting superior forces at considerable risk to himself . . . not in dropping booby traps for unwary infants. I therefore object to the modus in which the American troops obey their high commander. This modus is not in the spirit of Washington or of Stephen Decatur.

Pound hated war and detected a particular undercurrent in the previous wars of history. Wars, he said, were destructive to nation-states, but profitable for the special interests. Pound said international bankers—Jewish bankers, in particular—were those who were the primary beneficiaries of the profits of from war. He pulled no punches when he declared:

Sometime the Anglo-Saxon may awaken to the fact that . . . nations are shoved into wars in order to destroy themselves, to break up their structure, to destroy their social order, to destroy their populations. And no more flaming and flagrant case appears in history than our own American Civil War, said to be an occidental record for size of armies employed and only sur-

passed by the more recent triumphs of [the Warburg banking family:] the wars of 1914 and the present one.

Although World War II itself was much on Pound's mind, the poet's primary concern, referenced repeatedly throughout his broadcasts, was the issue of usury and the control of money and economy by private special interests:

There is no freedom without economic freedom. Freedom that does not include freedom from debt is plain bunkum. It is fetid and foul logomachy [wordplay] to call such servitude freedom . . . Yes, freedom from all sorts of debt, including debt at usurious interest.

Usury, he said, was a cause of war throughout history. In Pound's view understanding the issue of usury was central to understanding history: "Until you know who has lent what to whom, you know nothing whatever of politics, you know nothing whatever of history, you know nothing of international wrangles". He added:

The usury system does no nation . . . any good whatsoever. It is an internal peril to him who hath, and it can make no use of nations in the play of international diplomacy save to breed strife between them and use the worst as flails against the best. It is the usurer's game to hurl the savage against the civilized opponent. The game is not pretty, it is not a very safe game. It does no one any credit.

Pound thus traced the history of the current war:

This war did not begin in 1939. It is not a unique result of the infamous Versailles Treaty. It is impossible to understand it without knowing at least a few precedent historic events, which mark the cycle of combat. No man can understand it without knowing at least a few facts and their chronological sequence.

This war is part of the age-old struggle between the usurer and the rest of mankind: between the usurer and peasant, the usurer and producer, and finally between the usurer and the merchant, between usurocracy and the mercantilist system . . .

The present war dates at least from the founding of the Bank of England at the end of the 17th century, 1694-8. Half a

century later, the London usurocracy shut down on the issue of paper money by the Pennsylvania colony, AD 1750.

This is not usually given prominence in the U.S. school histories. The 13 colonies rebelled, quite successfully, 26 years later, AD 1776.

According to Pound, it was the money issue (above all) that united the Allies during the second 20th-century war against Germany:

Gold. Nothing else uniting the three governments, England Russia, United States of America. That is the interest—gold usury, debt, monopoly, class interest, and possibly gross indifference and contempt for humanity."

Although "gold" was central to the world's struggle, Pound still felt gold "is a coward. Gold is not the backbone of nations. It is their ruin. A coward, at the first breath of danger gold flows away, gold flows out of the country.

Pound perceived Germany under Hitler as a nation that stood against the international money lenders and communist Russia under Stalin as a system that stood against humanity itself. He told his listeners:

Now if you know anything whatsoever of modern Europe and Asia, you know Hitler stands for putting men over machines. If you don't know that, you know nothing. And beyond that you either know or do not know that Stalin's regime considers humanity as nothing save raw material. Deliver so many carloads of human material at the consumption point.

That is the logical result of materialism. If you assert that men are dirty, that humanity is merely material, that is where you come out. And the old Georgian train robber [Josef Stalin—ed.] is perfectly logical. If all things are merely material, man is material—and the system of anti-man treats man as matter.

The real enemy, said Pound, was international capitalism. All people everywhere were victims:

They're working day and night, picking your pockets. Every day and all day and all night picking your pockets and picking the Russian working man's pockets."²⁵ Capital, however, he said, was "not international, it is not hypernational. It is subna-

tional. A quicksand under the nations, destroying all nations, destroying all law and government, destroying the nations, one at a time, Russian empire and Austria, 20 years past, France yesterday, England today.

According to Pound, Americans had no idea why they were being expected to fight in Britain's war with Germany:

Even Mr. Churchill hasn't had the grass to tell the American people why he wants them to die, to save what. He is fighting for the gold standard and monopoly. Namely the power to starve the whole of mankind, and make it pay through the nose before it can eat the fruit of its own labor.

As far as the English were concerned, in Pound's broadcasts aimed at the British Isles he warned his listeners that although Russian-style communist totalitarianism was a threat to British freedom, it was not the biggest threat Britain faced:

You are threatened. You are threatened by the Russian methods of administration. Those methods [are not] your sole danger. It is, in fact, so far from being your sole danger that I have, in over two years of talk over this radio, possibly never referred to it before. Usury has gnawed into England since the days of Elizabeth. First it was mortgages, mortgages on earls' estates; usury against the feudal nobility. Then there were attacks on the common land, filchings of village common pasture. Then there developed a usury system, an international usury system, from Cromwell's time, ever increasing.

In the end, Pound suggested, it would be the big money interests who would really win the war—not any particular nation-state—and the foundation for future wars would be set in place:

The nomadic parasites will shift out of London and into Manhattan. And this will be presented under a camouflage of national slogans. It will be represented as an American victory. It will not be an American victory.

The moment is serious. The moment is also confusing. It is confusing because there are two sets of concurrent phenomena, namely, those connected with fighting this war, and those which sow seeds for the next one.

Pound believed one of the major problems of the day—which itself had contributed to war fever—was the manipulation of the press, particularly in the United States: “I naturally mistrust newspaper news from America,” he declared. “I grope in the mass of lies, knowing most of the sources are wholly untrustworthy.” According to Pound:

The United States has been misinformed. The United States has been led down the garden path, and may be down under the daisies.

All through shutting out news. There is no end to the amount of shutting out news that the sons of blood who started this war, and wanted this war, and monkeyed around to get a war started and monkeyed around to keep the war going, and spreading.

There is no end to the shutting out and perversions of news that these blighters ain't up to, and that they haven't, and aren't still trying to compass.

Pound believed press manipulation was a historic phenomenon:

I ask my compatriots of my own age to note that the very high percentage of articles printed in American magazines contains a joker, that is a silent point, a basically false assumption. I don't mean they all contain the same false assumption. I point out that there is no public medium in the United States for serious discussion. Every [one] of these publications has subjects which its policy forbids it to mention or to mention without falsification. And I ask the men in my generation to consider the effects, the cumulative effect of this state of things which does not date from September 1941, but has been going on ever since we can remember.

Pound believed it was vital for the American people to circumvent the controlled press and to investigate current events—and history—for themselves. Long before anyone ever conceived of C-SPAN's daily broadcasts of congressional activity Pound suggested one way for the American people to have a better view of what was happening in official Washington: “You could put Congress on the air. Then you would know more of what your representatives are putting on you.”

The poet noted that the press was so controlled it was virtually impossible to express opinions contrary to those of the controllers of the media of the day:

You can't talk it over with me; because none of you can get to a radio. You can't print stuff like this in your papers, because the newspapers are not there to inform the people.”³⁴ Pound harkened back to the old Committees of Correspondence that existed in the American colonies prior to the American Revolution when he suggested: “You have got to talk to each other, you have got to write letters one to another [in order to be able to discuss the real issues of the day].

Pound also noted that the American press had failed to tell its readers that in Europe the Masonic order was a widely discussed issue. Pound said it ought to be news in America, but it wasn't: “Nothing will come as a greater shock to America in general,” he said, “but in particular to honest men who compose the greater part, numerically, of American Masonry, than the view held concerning that order in Europe.” Regarding the Masonic order, Pound asked: “What are the Masons? Where do they get their money? And who controls them?”

As far as the all-important question of money creation was concerned, Pound also saw the controlled press—and the academic establishment—covering up the truth. He was intrigued by the fact that there was precedent, in history, for the governments of nation-states to create money rather than relying upon private, special interests to do so:

For years economics professors have been lying, even going so far as to deprecate loans by the state, when the fleet that won the battle of Salamis was built with money lent by the Athenian state to the ship builders, instead of mortgaging the whole nation to . . . swine and enemies of the people as has been done in damn near every nation ever since the Stank [Bank] of England was founded. Well, states have lent money, and the Pennsylvania Colony lent it. And the French . . . are lending it. So the British fire on their late allies.

And every damn possible thing is done to prevent the American in Utah or Montana from learning economics or history. And our Constitution does give Congress the right to determine prices, though it is worded, “right to determine the value of money,” which is the same thing.

In Pound's judgment, the American people had fallen down on the job and not relied upon the greatest protection they had against the moneyed interests—the Constitution. “You have not kept the Constitution in force,” he said, adding:

You have not developed [the Constitution] according to its own internal laws . . . The main protection of the whole people is in the clause about Congress issuing money . . . but you have not wanted to maintain the Constitution. You have not wanted, that is, you have not had a will, to maintain the Constitution or to maintain honest, just government.

The U.S. Constitution, Pound said, was "for more than a century, in fact for 130 years, far and away the best on earth. I had always thought we could get all the social justice we need, by a few sane reforms of money, such as Adams and Lincoln would have thought honest and Constitutional. The grafters would rather throw you into a ten years war and kill off five or ten million young men than even let the discussion of monetary reform flower on the front pages of the American papers."

All of these warnings by Pound about the money system have been suppressed or ignored or forgotten.

Despite his international travel, his choice to live abroad, his fluency in foreign tongues, his cosmopolitan associations, Pound was very much an American nationalist and a patriot in the truest sense. American culture and history were the foundation of his thinking, and he was the first to proclaim it. At the same time, Pound felt the American people were badly misinformed about the realities of European history:

The Americans are unqualified for intervention. They are disqualified by reason for their intense, abysmal, unfathomable ignorance of the state and past facts of Europe. Even my colleagues in the Academy of Social and Political Science have no competent perception of the difference, the basic difference between the American problem and that of Europe. And most of them have not made any adequate use of even such fragmentary fragments of knowledge as they possess.

As far as the Jewish question was concerned, Pound never advocated extermination or discrimination against the Jews—contrary to what modern day "historians" might contend. Pound did perceive communism as an outgrowth of ancient Judaic teachings, calling communism "the left hand of Judah" (the right hand, presumably, being international finance capitalism) and declared:

The Bolshevik [anti-morality system] comes out of the Talmud, which is the dirtiest teaching any race ever codified. The Talmud is the one and only begetter of the Bolshevik system.

Pound sometimes resorted to the use of ethnic slurs, but earthy expressions and salty language were integral to the poet's style. Pound's real target was the international banking establishment—many of whose leaders were, in fact, Jews.

But he was not an enemy of the Jewish people: "Don't start a pogrom," he said. "That is, not an old-style killing of small Jews. That system is no good whatsoever. Of course if some man had a stroke of genius and could start a pogrom up at the top, there might be something to say for it. But on the whole legal measures are preferable."

Pound traced many historical problems to the direct involvement of Jewish financiers. For example, he pointed out:

Nobody with any historical knowledge says that the French revolution occurred without Jewish assistance. Nor that since that somewhat bloody upset and series of subsequent upsets the Jew weren't cock-a-hoop in the French capital.

A knowledge of the French commune would have helped us to understand the Russian November revolution. If we had had it. But handy and useful knowledge has an easy way of getting mislaid. Now what causes that?

Of the much-discussed Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, Pound had the following intriguing comment:

If or when one mentions the protocols alleged to be of the Elders of Zion, one is frequently met with the reply: Oh, but they are a forgery. Certainly they are a forgery, and that is the one proof we have of their authenticity.

The Jews have worked with forged documents for the past 24 hundred years, namely ever since they have had any documents whatsoever.

And no one can qualify as a historian of this half century without having examined the Protocols. Alleged, if you like, to have been translated from the Russian, from a manuscript to be consulted in the British Museum, where some such document may or may not exist . . .

Their interest lies in the type of mind, or the state of mind of their author. That was their interest for the psychologist the day they first appeared.

And for the historian two decades later, when the program contained in them has so crushingly gone into effect up to a point, or down to a squalor.

Pound saw the ongoing war as an enemy of culture and he acknowledged his goal was stopping the war, if he could: "Oh yes, I want it to stop. I didn't start it. I should like to conserve a few art works, a few mosaics, a few printed volumes, I should like to shore, or bring to beach what is left of the world's cultural heritage, including libraries and architectural monuments. To serve as models for new construction."

Contrary to his modern reputation for "racism," Pound resented racist attacks on the Japanese by the Allies. Shortly after Pearl Harbor he remarked that:

A BBC commentator somewhere about January 8 was telling his presumably music hall audience the Japs were jackals, and that they had just recently, I think he said within living men's lifetime, emerged from barbarism. I don't know what patriotic end you think, or he thinks, or the British authorities think is served by such fetid ignorance.

Pound told his audience the United States had, "with unspeakable vulgarity . . . insulted the most finely tempered people on earth, threatening them with starvation, threatening them with encirclement and telling them they were too low down to fight.

The result, he said, was Pearl Harbor and American intervention in the war. Pound also recognized Japan's Chinese enemies were as much victims of the international money lenders and intriguers as were the Japanese. In colorful language evoking lively imagery that only Pound could conjure up, he declared:

There are millions of Chinamen, many of them living on very short rations in the interior and about as much interested in Chiang Kai-shek as they are in the White Socks and the Phillies, if there still are any Phillies.

You could get more enthusiasm out of those Chinks for a Hot Dog Championship on the Northside than you could for Chiang's foreign party in China.

A lot of China is not pro-Kai-shek. A lot of China is not for that gang of foreign investors.

Pound was very much attuned to the nationalist instincts of other peoples. He was no xenophobe, no inward-looking country bumpkin. Pound was an American nationalist who knew there were nationalistic strivings all across the globe—that nationalists everywhere wanted their peoples to be free of the big money interests:

Parts of the world prefer local control, of their own money power and credit. It may be deplorable (in the eyes of Wall Street and Washington) that such aspirations toward personal and national liberty still persist, but so is it.

Some people, some nations, prefer their own administration, to that of Baruch and . . . the Sassoons, and the problem is: how many more millions of British, Russians, and Americans of both the northern and southern American continents, plus Zulus, Basutos, Hottentots, etc. and the lower, so-called lower races, phantom governments, Maccabees and their sequelae, are expected to die in the attempt to crush out European and Japanese independence?

Pound had a profound respect for the European contribution to civilization: "Europe is an organic body, its life continues, its life has components and nearly every damn thing that has made your lives worth living up to this moment, has had its origins right here in Europe. In Pound's view, the rise of fascism in Italy and Germany was an exclusively European phenomenon, one that should be of no concern to America:

Europe with systems of government less modern than ours, Germany and Italy with the leftovers of earlier centuries, especially Germany, saw revolutions. Worked out a new system suited to Europe. It is not our American affair.

We could with honor advocate freedom of the seas. For Europe as well as for a few Jew controlled shipping firms.

We could, with honor advocate natural commerce; that is, a commerce wherein each nation would exchange what it has, what it has in superfluity or abundance, with what other nations can or will spare.

We could stand for that sort of commerce instead of trying to throttle it.

Why do we not? Why should all men under 40 be expected to die or be maimed in support of flagrant injustice, monopoly and a dirty attempt to strangle and starve out 30 nations?

Pound felt there was much to be said for the social and economic achievements of Italy and Germany and that they could prove a model for the rest of the Western World: "Every social reform that has gone into effect in Germany and Italy should be defended," he said. "And the best men in England know that as well as I do. The time of calumny is past, and its passing should be seen very clearly.

Conscious of the reforms effected in Italy and Germany, Pound saw similar possibilities for the American system. Pound believed the U.S. Constitution itself provided Americans the mechanism for change. However, he said, "You have not made use of the machinery provided in the Constitution itself, to keep the American government modern."⁵⁵ Pound suggested:

You could keep the Constitution, and under that Constitution every state in the Union could reorganize its system of representation. Any or every state could elect its Congressmen on trade basis . . . Any or every state could organize its congressional representation on a corporate basis. Carpenters, artisans, mechanics, could have one representative; writers, doctors, and lawyers could have one representative.

You could perfectly legally and constitutionally divide up the representatives of any or every state on the basis of trades and professions and the life of that state, every man in it, would gain representation in Congress; and Congress would take on an honesty and reality no American in our time has dreamed of.

Present Congressmen are mostly so ignorant that some people have thought it might be useful to have a bit of congressional education. Insist on Congressmen being able to pass an exam in at least some of the subject matters they are expected to vote on . . . I think the representation by trades and profession would be a better way out, with, if you like, different exams for the different trades and professions.

That could do no harm whatsoever. Man to represent steel workers, to be able to show he knows the working of steel; miner to know the workings of mines; professional to represent his profession, really to represent his profession, the best qualities, most acute knowledge of his profession. That would certainly lead to efficiency. Health regulations would be decided by someone who knew something about sanitation. Rules for mining coal, rates per day, decided by someone who knows coal don't just crawl out of a mine, while somebody sits round playing pinochle . . .

I am telling you how to oil up the machine and change a few gadgets so that it would work as the founders intended.

Quick and certain to draw distinctions between U.S. and European traditions, however, Pound declared: "Class war is not an American product, not from the roots of the nation. Not in our historic process. And

the racial solution, which is Europe's solution, which is in Europe's process, rooted deep down, un-uprootable."

He told his listeners it was vital they study the evolution of the American system, and why the American Revolution took place to begin with—yes, it had to do with money:

Colonies, pretty much racially homogeneous, evolved. They found a solution for the problem of money, not of fields against money, not of colonists, farmers fighting money, but of fields and money working together, and they found it in Pennsylvania, and the world said, "How marvelous." And an unjust, usurious, monopolist government shut down on the money—money handed out to the colonists to facilitate their field production, the repayment not going to a set of leeches and exploiters. And the unjust monopolist government, namely the British, was hoofed out [of] the colonies 30 years later.

Full of contempt for those whom a real historian—his friend, Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes—called the "Court Historians" of the day, Pound recognized people could not make correct decisions about the course of their future if they were being lied to about their past: "You have a half-dozen historians but not all of them, by any means, are able to take out the facts and show how they hitch together."

The great iconoclast wondered, however, why people could not look at recent events that took place within their own time frame and see why things were happening as they were. To the people of war-torn England he addressed this poignant inquiry:

Have you no . . . eyes, no knowledge or . . . memory of events that have happened before you?

Do you know only watery pools where were the cellars of London, only the material ruins, having no knowledge of . . . deeper causes, of why these things have come on you, or what you have done, or in most cases omitted, and which have caused these things to come on you, and have you no wish to know why this has happened?

Pound suggested some good reading for his American listeners who might have a desire to bring back American tradition:

Two great friendships, at the base of American history. John Adams and Jefferson, Van Buren and Andy Jackson. You can pass

the time reading that history. It will make the boys better citizens. Make any young man more American if he sticks to seeing American history first before swallowing exotic perversions.

Knowledge—basic historical knowledge—was vital, according to Pound. That theme—that knowledge was critical—was central to all of his wartime broadcasts. He urged his listeners to know who they were and why the world was in crisis. To his listeners, Pound urged this much:

Don't die like a beast. If you are dead set to be sunk in the mid-Atlantic or Pacific or scorched in the desert, at least know why it is done to you. To die not knowing why is to die like an animal . . . To die like a human being you have at least got to know why it is done to you.

Pound's graphic words could well be a warning to modern-day Americans in this age when American soldiers are being asked to fight and die in endless brush-fire wars around the globe—wars that enrich their real enemies—the very plutocrats Pound so fiercely condemned.

Pound's defense attorney, who found the transcripts of the broadcasts "dreary," later summarized them as follows:

There was no criticism of the allied war effort in the broadcasts; nothing was said to discourage or disturb American soldiers or their families.

Pound's main concern was with usury and other economic sins which he conceived were being committed by an international conspiracy of Jewish bankers who were the powers behind the throne of England and had succeeded in duping the government of the United States.

The broadcasts were in essence lectures in history and political and economic theory, highly critical of the course of American government beginning with Alexander Hamilton . . .

The American people were told they did not understand what was going on in Europe and if they did, the war would not have been necessary.

Was Pound a traitor—or a prophet? I know the answer to that question, and I am proud, without hesitation, to call Ezra Pound's views my own.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

ISRAEL: The Failed State; Does It Reflect Modern-Day Jewry?

In the 2005 updated edition of his book *The Provincials: A Personal History of Jews in the South*, Eli N. Evans—who comes from a distinguished Jewish family of the South—wrote of Al Rosenfeld, owner of a ladies' dress shop in Jackson, Mississippi. Rosenfeld once tore down the Israeli flag at a Hadassah meeting, upsetting many of the Jewish ladies in the community.

Rosenfeld explained his feelings: "Those people over there in Israel think of me as part of them and I plain resent it. Here, they always bother me for money; I just can't seem to shake 'em. I just don't believe that the church and politics mix."

When asked as to whether he would one day want to visit Israel, Rosenfeld said, "I have no more desire to go over there than I have to paddle up the Amazon River in a canoe sweating bullets."

It is accurate to thus say that Mr. Rosenfeld was a patriotic American. He did not place Israel's interests over those of America. And we can only wish that there were more Jews like Rosenfeld today. But those Jews who share the candid, American patriotic passions of Mr. Rosenfeld are, unfortunately, few and far between.

Contrast the story of Mr. Rosenfeld with that of Benjamin Steward, an American-born Jewish lad from Rockville, Maryland.

On May 3, 2007 *Washington Jewish Week* published a remarkable and revealing article about Steward who had joined the Israeli Army several years before. According to the Jewish newspaper, when people asked Steward's family why their son would join another nation's army, Steward's father responds: "He's a Jew and, therefore, it's not someone else's army. It's his army." And that does indeed tell us a lot.

Whether we like it or not, this tiny—yet powerful—entity known as Israel stands at the apex of the global Jewish phenomenon and is pivotal to the problem of anti-Semitism. Although it emerged as a state only in 1948, Israel has been central to the turmoil of our times. And in many respects, we can only wonder if Israel—as a nation, one that is rent with internal turmoil and constantly at odds with its neighbors and the entire planet (or so it seems)—reflects the state of modern-day Jewry itself.

There are those (including many Jews) who—with the best of intentions—rush forward to say that Israel does not reflect the Jewish people. And we can respect the point they are trying to make. Yet, at the same time, we hear the constant cacophony of voices proclaiming Israel as "the Jewish state" and the axis of the Jewish universe—the ultimate fulfillment of God's word and central to mankind's future itself.

With that consideration in mind, let us explore the nature of Israel today. And we can best begin by recalling the words of Ramsey MacDonald, the British statesman, reflecting upon the emergence of Israel as a nation and the British role in bringing Israel into being. His words, in some tragic ways, mirror the entire reality of the modern Jewish plight vis-a-vis its relationship to Israel, for the problems resulting from the rise of Zionism and the establishment of Israel have, as we have said, come to be central to the Jewish world of today. MacDonald said:

We encouraged an Arab revolt against Turkey by promising to create an Arab kingdom including Palestine. At the same time we were encouraging the Jews to help us, by promising them that Palestine could be placed at their disposal for settlement and government; and also, at the same time, we were secretly making with France the Sykes-Picot Agreement, partitioning the territory which we had instructed our governor-general of Egypt to promise to the Arabs.

No one who has felt the undercurrent of Eastern movements can console himself with the belief that the Arab has forgotten or forgiven, or that the moral evil we committed will speedily cease to have political influence. Our treatment of the Muslims has been a madness.

MacDonald spoke after the fact. But in the early days of the 20th Century there were sensible Jewish voices, standing in opposition to the establishment of a Zionist state, who recognized the dangers of Zionism.

We thus remember Meyer London, a liberal New York congressman—a Jew who was fervently anti-Zionist—who said candidly: "Let us stop pretending about the Jewish past and let us stop making fools of ourselves about the Jewish future."

In truth, while (as we know) Israel was set in place on a tissue of historical lies and religious misrepresentations, Israel's existence today is largely artificial to the point that its most vociferous defenders find it necessary to distort the very nature and foundations of "the Jewish state," presenting it as something that it is not.

One such defender of Israel is Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz who has written numerous book-length expositions defending Israel and defaming "anti-Semites." His 2000 book, *What Israel Means to Me* (published by John Wiley & Sons) is an assembly of pro-Israel meanderings by an assortment of Jews and a handful of Gentiles who have made their names (and considerable fortunes) by lending their support, in one way or another, to the Jewish agenda.

In his book, Dershowitz includes a commentary by former U.S. Education Secretary William Bennett (an Irish-Catholic) whose entire career has been advanced by Jewish associates in the infamous "neo-conservative" circles surrounding the late Irving Kristol, the ex-Trotskyite who established an influential network of proteges (largely, but not exclusively, Jewish) who have now come to dominate a considerable swath of public-opinion-shaping organizations and think tanks that hold great power in American policy-making today. Bennett perpetuates the idea—the lie—that Israel is somehow a sweet little democracy in which all people of all faiths have equal rights and privileges:

In its very declaration of independence, Israel proclaimed that it would "ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants, irrespective of religion, race, or sex; it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education, and culture; it will safeguard the holy places of all religions." Israel has kept faith with the promise of its founding, a founding more similar to America's than perhaps any other nation's. Israel is the only country in the region that permits citizens of all faiths to worship freely and openly.

This extraordinary assertion—all of it baseless—exemplifies the very nature of the Jewish state (which obviously ignores the rhetoric of its own grand declaration of independence) and the extent to which those who will defend Israel will boldly and unashamedly lie in the face of reality in order to propagandize on behalf of Israel.

What might be called the extraordinary "truth gap" on the part of fanatic Jews promoting Israel's cause is exemplified, likewise, in the writings of Mitchell Bard, executive director of the American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise. His 2007 book *Will Israel Survive?* (published by Palgrave MacMillan) claims, among other false things, that "Israel remains a focal point of Christianity and the one place in all the Middle East where Christians can practice their faith freely." (What a lie!)

Bard also adopts the simply audacious propaganda claim that "American Jews have an almost pathological fear that the media will turn the American people against Israel and the public will then demand that the United States government change its policy toward Israel in a way that will lead to its destruction."

The very suggestion by Bard that the Jewish-controlled media in the United States would somehow "turn the American people against Israel" demonstrates the almost perverse nature of the propaganda line that Bard is putting forth. Why, of all things, the Jewish-controlled media

would shift its historic (one might even say “hysterical”) pro-Israel bias is something that Bard chooses not to explain, precisely, of course, for the reason that there is no explanation for such a ridiculous claim.

And then, while Bard suggests that there has been rising sentiment in the United States against Israel (because of its bad behavior, or, rather, in Bard’s view, Israel’s *perceived* bad behavior), he says that, in the end, everybody really does love little Israel.

Yet, Bard also asserts that “on matters pertaining to Israel, Congress pays little attention to public opinion or the media and has not wavered in its support [for Israel].”

In other words, Congress cares not what the American people—who pay its salaries and to whom it (Congress) is ostensibly responsible—think about U.S. Middle East policy: *that is, if Americans should happen (somehow) to become hostile to Israel, then it would make no difference to their representatives in Congress!* (A remarkable assertion.)

In a particularly deceptive flourish, Bard explains that people all over the United States recognize that closer economic ties with Israel are a very good deal for Americans. He notes, for example, that the Texas state department of agriculture and the Israeli ministry of agriculture set up the Texas-Israel Exchange in 1984 to promote mutually-beneficial agreements between the two agencies, and then points out that “at least 20 other states have signed similar agreements with Israel and that it is now routine for state governors to lead state delegations to Israel.”

All of this grandstanding by Bard ignores the fact that the primary reason that states and state governors and all manner of public officials (local, state, and federal) enter into such incestuous agreements with Israel is precisely because of the fact that the Israeli lobby—in all of its nationwide facets, reaching into every major city in America and down to even some of the mid-sized and smaller municipalities where Jewish political influence exists—*demand*s that American public officials enter into such agreements, the benefits (or lack thereof) to *American* interests notwithstanding.

Reading Bard, one realizes that he is expressing not what *is* reality but rather what he *wishes* to be reality. It is as if he is practicing the age-old “Big Lie.” Bard believes that by repeating untruths over and over again, those untruths will suddenly become fact.

It should be noted, though, that at one point Bard does make a rare retreat into total honesty. Pointing out that President John Adams—whom he proclaims an American Zionist—hoped that Jews could return to Judea as an “independent nation,” Bard noted that less often cited, in reference to Adams’ support for Zionism, is the rest of what Adams had to say in regard to the Jews. Adams said:

I believe [that] . . . once restored to an independent government and no longer persecuted they [the Jews] would soon wear away some of the asperities and peculiarities of their character and possibly in time become liberal Unitarian Christians for your Jehovah is our Jehovah and your God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is our God.

Hardly comments that could be viewed as friendly, to say the least. But Bard—typically—was trying to make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear. And it is probably worth noting—as we saw in our opening pages—that two of Adams’ best known descendants—Henry Adams and Brooks Adams—were most assuredly what many would call . . . anti-Semites.

Another Zionist writer, Max Dimont, (whose work I have cited extensively in my book, *The New Babylon*) has also marveled at how amazing and successful has been the Zionist enterprise in Palestine.

In his book, *The Indestructible Jews*, Dimont boasted Israel had risen “from beggary to affluence, from cultural poverty to intellectual eminence in five short decades” and Israel had done so “without tying her fate to an outside power, succeeded in securing a standard of life, liberty, and law on a par with that of the most advanced Western nation.”

As I said succinctly in *The New Babylon* and which I reiterate here: “Nothing could be further from the truth.”

Entire encyclopedias could catalogue the mountain ranges of dollars in German reparations payments and U.S. foreign aid, grants, military assistance and all manner of special favors to Israel.

We need not belabor the obvious point or attempt to document all of this factual data here—all of which together points out the utter hypocrisy in the words of Dimont and others of his audacious ilk.

Israel has only achieved affluence through beggary, making it certainly the wealthiest panhandler on the face of the planet.

If only the homeless beggars on the streets of Washington, DC—the American capital from which flows the trillions of dollars in American tax dollars to the coffers of Israel—could do so well.

If only the 5,000 homeless American war veterans living on the streets of Washington could enjoy such beneficence.

Despite these basic facts—which are indisputable—we still find insistent in the Jewish-controlled media the theme that Israel is truly a special institution that the American people (and, really, the rest of the planet) cannot live without, that it is somehow a God-given example of economic success and stability, a model for all others to emulate; that Israel (in so many ways) is the finest and most magnificent national construct ever achieved.

One of the most extraordinarily philo-Semitic fanatics is George Gilder, a cousin of the Rockefeller family, famed for his greed-worshipping book *Wealth and Poverty*. But his most recent (similarly-oriented) book is *The Israel Test*, published in 2009 by Richard Vigilante Books.

Like his earlier work, this book is very much over-the-top but the nature of the book (in terms of its objective in advancing the interests of Israel and the Jewish Agenda) is quite revealing, inasmuch as the book is aimed at success-oriented Americans eager for a fast-buck solution to their own need (and greed) in a time of global economic upheavals.

In short, it's a clever melding of "self-help" and "get-rich-quick" with plain old-fashioned Zionist and Jewish propaganda. The book is described by its publisher:

Israel is the crucial battlefield for Capitalism and Freedom in our time. Gilder's global bestseller *Wealth and Poverty* made the moral case for capitalism.

Now Gilder makes that case for Israel, portraying a conflict of barbarism, envy and death against civilization, creativity, and life. Gilder reveals Israel as the leader of human civilization, technological progress and scientific advance.

Tiny Israel stands only behind the United States in its contributions to the high tech economy. Israel has become the world's paramount example of the blessings of freedom and yet Israel is the most hated nation in the world today. Why?

Israel is hated for her virtues, for her achievements, for all that she has done well. Israel is hated, as the United States is hated, because Israel is successful, because Israel is free, and because Israel is good. Wherever Jews are free to invent and create, they achieve conspicuous success—arousing envy and resentment.

In his book, the author, Gilder, absolutely devotes himself to the theme of Jewish supremacy—and we have already explored that concept in these pages. But, for the present, note that, as far as the state of Israel is concerned, Gilder concludes directly:

Israel is not a dispensible Jewish "best friend," a noble but doomed democracy, or even a charitable dependency that we can no longer afford. It is an indispensable ally and in the past twenty years it has evolved into perhaps our most valuable partner. Yet, for most Americans, ultimately our loyalty to Israel arises not from a cold calculus of survival, but from a sense of the

holy. What Americans must fathom with both heart and mind is that this instinct is true—and vital to our survival—that if we would live, we must defend this holy land.

So despite all of this rhetoric touting Israel—and *rhetoric* it is—let us review the Jewish state as it really is, not as its defenders would have us believe it is. Let us look at some cold, hard facts.

As far back as 1994, Jewish-American professor Dr. Norman Cantor encapsulated the truth about Israel—as a state, as an entity, as an economic force—in his quite controversial book, *The Sacred Chain* (published by HarperCollins):

The fact is that the Jewish economy in Israel, from the first decade of the century to today, has never been a viable one. The Jews in Zion have never been able to support themselves.

The balance sheet has always been negative. They have survived only by covering their deficits with foreign aid—Jewish charity lavishly allotted from abroad, and from—since around 1970—extensive American governmental aid.

[Israel] is a country where every inch of its ancient soil is revered, and archeological discoveries are greeted with national celebration, but which treats its fragile ecology with a recklessness that astounds an American or a Canadian.

It has no pollution controls on its automobile emissions and spews raw sewage into the Mediterranean, fouling its own beaches.

The worst thing about Israel in the 1980s and early 1990s was that it allowed itself to become thoroughly dependent on American government aid for both military and civilian purposes. . . .

When it is factored in that Jewish charitable sources abroad provide annually a similar sum, Israel has to be recognized as a severely debtor nation, a colonial country, unable to provide for itself, greedily and recklessly used to living off other peoples' money.

[Israel] has become intoxicated, not like many of their distressed forefathers with mystical religion, but with military glamor and triumphalist images, a dangerous and self-destructive mindset in a sober and competitive world at the end of the 20th Century.

And what Cantor wrote nearly two decades ago remains true—

even more so. Despite the constant media rhetoric about "the Israeli success story" (for example, the claims of the aforementioned George Gilder), American Jewish writer, Joel Kovel laid out the facts—just some of them—in his 2007 book *Overcoming Zionism* (published by Pluto Press in London). Kovel noted:

Despite the enormous aid given to it by its American protector and the benefits of the international Jewish community, Israel remains a society in grave social and economic crisis, with rampant unemployment, pockets of outright hunger, and many signs of social disintegration. . . . It now has the greatest gap between rich and poor in the whole industrialized world. More than half of Israeli families cannot meet their monthly bills, and 14 percent cannot buy an adequate diet.

Kovel cited a 2004 commentary in Israel's *Ha'aretz* by Michael Melchior, a member of the Israeli Knesset who observed of Israel:

We live in a society in which a million and a quarter people, 40% of them working people, are below the poverty line. This is a society that abandons 366,000 of its children-at-risk and throws them into the street; a society that treats its foreign workers like animals; a society that despises its elderly and sends them to rummage through the garbage.

It is a society, according to information given the Knesset Committee for Children's Rights, where in the absence of standards, a social worker has to devote an average of two minutes to a family in distress. It is a society among the leaders in the world trafficking of women.

For his own part, Kovel noted further:

Israel provides the worst primary and secondary education in the Western world, despite having budgeted adequate funds. It also scores below many poorer countries, for example Malaysia, Thailand, and Romania, which provide [Israel] with cheap textiles and labor.

But on a more direct level, Israel today faces a growing crisis with immense geopolitical implications for its own survival. And this crisis does not stem from the Jewish conflict with the indigenous Christians and Muslims who have been reduced to second or third class status with-

in Israel's borders and within the disputed occupied territories. Rather the Israeli people themselves are divided and to a degree that most people outside Israel (even including many Jews) do not realize. Israel may well be on its way toward civil war—and the truth is that this potential civil war is erupting on several levels, as we shall see.

In one respect, the internal conflict deals directly with the issue of Israel's relationship (or non-relationship, as the case may be) with the Palestinian Arabs.

But on a more critical level—from an internal Jewish perspective, so to speak—the conflict stems from a growing confrontation between the secular (even classically agnostic or atheistic) Jewish population of Israel and the deeply-religious (really, fanatical) elements among Israel's Jews.

The amazing truth is that most American (and worldwide) Christian supporters of Israel have no knowledge of these realities but if they did, they almost certainly wouldn't understand them, for the sad truth is that these Christians simply do not recognize that virtually everything they believe about Israel (and about Judaism) is very far from the truth.

So what then are these conflicts in Israel that could spell the end of this Jewish nation-state?

As far back as 2004, writing in the fervently pro-Israel journal, *The New Republic* (TNR), widely respected American Jewish writer Leon Wieseltier raised the specter of a civil war in Israel. "Israel's Coming War Within" was the title of Wieseltier's frightening commentary.

Citing translations from the September 10, 2004 issue of the Hebrew-language version of the Israeli newspaper, *Ha'aretz*, Wieseltier described how prominent figures of Israel's hard-line conservative movement had called on members of the Israeli Army to resist any orders to participate in the expulsion or removal of Jewish settlers in the Gaza strip, historically Egyptian territory seized by Israel in the June 1967 war and occupied by Israel until its then-recent "withdrawal."

Now Wieseltier was not the only Jewish (or Israeli) writer speculating on these matters which, in fact, were a subject of frequent discussion in Israeli newspapers (in particular) and, to a lesser degree, in publications circulating within the American Jewish community.

But note carefully that with the passage of time, the situation has not been resolved. If anything, the matter has gotten worse—even more so. On January 11, 2011 even *Time* magazine featured a cover story describing the rise of hard-line "right wing" Jewish fundamentalists in the ranks of the Israeli military who refuse (it seems) any gestures toward accommodation of the Christians and Muslims of Palestine.

And from an American perspective—that is, the perspective of Americans who do not believe that Israel's interests are America's and

vice-versa—this is a very real matter for concern. The rising influence of these extremist forces, both in the ranks of the military (including its highest ranks) and in the Israeli political arena could—and will—make the state of Israel all the more dangerous, particularly because of the fact of the existence of Israel's well-armed arsenal of nuclear weapons of mass destruction—said to be perhaps the fifth largest on the planet.

But while Israel is split domestically over the disposition of the issue of the Palestinian Christians and Muslims—a matter (I believe) that will never be resolved until those people are brought fully into the realm of participation in Israel's political decision-making through the popular voting process (something that is not likely to occur except through global intervention)—the truth is that the perhaps more profound domestic crisis in Israel stems from the religious divisions among the Jews within Israel itself.

And again—to repeat the point—this is something that so few Christian devotees of Israel know about or understand.

American pro-Israel Jewish writer Milton Viorst's 2002 book, *What Shall I Do With This People?*, published by the Free Press, described some of the highly-contentious and bitter religious-based conflicts in Israel that so many outside Israel find so hard to comprehend.

Discussing what he called the matter of "Jews and the fractious politics of Judaism," Viorst's book laid out the problems in Israel, such that his publishers said of his work that "Not since the destruction of the Second Temple have Jews displayed such intolerance toward one another or battled so fiercely over ideology," and that—throughout the centuries—Jewish religious leaders had shaped Judaism "to serve their own political ends, often with disastrous consequences."

And now, Viorst's book pointed out, these internal Jewish battles have come to the fore in Israel—the Jewish state—itsself.

Viorst described just one aspect of the internal Jewish conflict within Israel, noting for example:

From 1967 on, not only Reform and Conservative Jews, but Orthodox women have been subject to abuse at the [Wailing Wall in Jerusalem]. Women were required to pray apart from the men . . . They were also barred from conducting their own services. Israel's Supreme Court, after a lawsuit was brought by modern Orthodox women, reaffirmed this segregation of genders but authorized separate services in which women were to be allowed to wear the talith and read from the Torah.

And it might be added—in this day when we hear so much in the

Jewish-controlled mass media about Muslim mistreatment of women—that this alone should raise questions about Israel in the minds of those Christians and others who are constantly railing against Islam regarding its alleged attitudes toward women, while ignoring Orthodox Judaism's ugly record in the treatment of women.

Referring to the rise of hatred and religious extremism in Israel, Viorst writes that "history may be telling us that the Jews' descent into violence cast doubt upon the ability of the state, and perhaps of the community itself, to survive."

All of this conflict in Israel is particularly interesting since even Theodore Herzl—the godfather of Zionism—essentially argued at the famous Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland that establishing a Jewish refuge in the Holy Land had "nothing to do with religion,"—a point, many will find hard to understand, particularly without a full knowledge of the political nature of Judaism and of the tangled history of Zionism.

My own work, *The New Babylon*, points out that—contrary to popular misperception—Zionism (in its broadest sense) goes far beyond the basic concept of devotion to the establishment of a centrally-located, geographically- and politically-definable nation-state based, in this case, on the theme of Jewish nationalism.

In fact, in historical reality, a Zionist state (in this case, Israel) has emerged, more or less, as a symbolic, some say "spiritual," base of operations for the global Jewish Agenda, and that, obviously, goes far beyond simple "nationalism" as it is known today and always has been known.

So while masquerading as a "nationalist" movement, Zionism has always really been just another aspect of Jewish internationalism, universalism, globalism—yes, all reaching back to what has been called the New World Order, the concept first and best defined by (and laid forth in) the energetic debates among Jewish spiritual leaders commemorated in the Jewish Talmud and based on the teachings of the Old Testament.

But for our immediate purposes we are not exploring the Jewish outlook in Israel toward either the Christians and Muslims in the Middle East or even toward the rest of the "Goyim" across the planet that the Jews one day hope to dominate.

Rather, now, we are exploring the internal conflicts within Israel among its Jewish inhabitants that raise the very real question: Can Israel continue to exist as a state?

We've already cited the revealing work of Milton Viorst, but even more than Viorst's book, Noah J. Efron's *Real Jews: Secular vs. Ultra-Orthodox in the Struggle for Jewish Identity in Israel* (published in 2003 by Persius Books) lays out the increasingly angry confrontation between Jewish religious and cultural factions within Israel.

As the title of the book makes clear, this eye-opening volume discusses the conflicts between the secular Jews of Israel and the Ultra-Orthodox who rival them for cultural and political power.

According to Efron, secular Jews charge that the religious Jews—the Haredi—“prey” on the youth of Israel. He notes that non-fiction accounts of Haredi debauchery are popular reading in Israel. There was one book, a memoir describing a young man’s accounts of his father’s serial seductions of young boys. Another volume was said to be an “anthropological study of the ultra-Orthodox with special attention to their sexual habits.”

Such revelations would certainly shock many Christians who cherish the idea that the Jews of Israel are *all* very deeply religious and moral people, *especially* those bearded Orthodox Jews who study religious teachings morning, noon and night.

But here we have secular Jews suggesting the religious Jews are, to put it bluntly, quite perverted—something if alleged by a non-Jew would be quickly referred to as the perpetuation of an “anti-Semitic stereotype.”

And speaking of “anti-Semitism,” while Jewish accounts of Jewish life in Europe during World War II are always rife with sad tales of evil Nazis shearing the beards of deeply-religious Orthodox Jews—invariably rabbis—Efron describes how secular Jews have had great merriment in tormenting their bearded co-religionists. In one instance cited by Efron, a young secular Jewish lad told an Orthodox Jew: “What I would really like to do is hold you down and shave off that beard. That would be really fun. Would you mind if I shaved off your beard?”

Efron points out that the secular Jews of Israel believe that “cheating is an ideology” for the Orthodox Jews and that the Orthodox are responsible for massive vote fraud in Israel today. The secular Jews contend that the Orthodox Jews “enlist people and resources from outside Israel to influence internal politics,” a remarkable and hypocritical accusation in light of the fact that Jews from across the planet (particularly the United States) have increasingly involved themselves, in one fashion or another, in Israel’s internal political affairs.

In fact, it seems, the deeply religious Jews—who are so heralded by Christians of the West as being part of the “vibrant little democracy” in Israel—actually propound what Efron says is considered a “fundamental rejection of democratic values.”

One researcher, according to Efron, has found studies that demonstrate that “two of every three Orthodox Jews favor dismantling Israel’s democracy in favor of a theocracy, basically rule by a junta of rabbis, with the Torah as a constitution and the Talmud and rabbinic Halakha as the legal code.” Ultimately, Efron writes, “democracy, as a concept, as an institution, as a value, is held in low esteem by Israel’s Ultra-Orthodox.”

Even one of America’s best-known and immensely-respected hard-line Zionists, Martin Peretz, longtime publisher of *The New Republic* magazine, is one of those secular Jews who doesn’t have nice things to say about those deeply religious Jews. Peretz was quoted in *The New York Times Magazine* of January 30, 2011 as saying: “They don’t work, they don’t serve [in the Israeli military], all they do is drain the state. The more children they have, the more the state pays them. It’s insane.”

(But in all fairness to Peretz, he holds Muslims in equally low regard. This respected Jewish advocate for Israel once asserted on his *New Republic* blog: “Muslim life is cheap.” And just imagine the response if a Muslim leader had posted on his blog: “Jewish life is cheap.” It would have been reported 24/7 in the Jewish-controlled media.)

If anything, Peretz’s comments about the Orthodox Jews point to yet another remarkable aspect of the rise of religious fundamentalism in Israel that would (and should) confound any non-Jew outside Israel: on the one hand, while there are Jewish fundamentalists who are among the most hard-line members of the Israeli military (as referenced earlier) there are also the others among the Orthodox who—as Peretz pointed out—refuse to serve in the military and who are exempt from doing so.

This contradiction alone should demonstrate the quite complex nature of the ongoing religious conflicts in Israel—with even the deeply religious factions split among themselves vis-a-vis their attitude toward the Jewish state and their responsibilities thereto.

The late Israeli writer Israel Shabak—an outspoken critic of Israel’s treatment of the Palestinians and of its aggressive foreign policies—joined with his co-author, American Jewish academic Norton Mezvinsky, in writing an extensive analysis, *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel* (republished in a new edition in 2004 by Pluto Books of London).

This revealing work explores the many intricacies of Jewish fundamentalism in its many varieties and should be considered “must” reading by anyone who seeks to have even a glimmer of understanding of the twisted trails of thought that prevail in Israel today.

And, incidentally, in reference to the idea that many Christian devotees of Israel believe that the Orthodox Jews are fervently devoted to the Old Testament—an idea that makes many Christian hearts flutter with delight—Shabak and Mezvinsky point out:

The most fundamentalist Orthodox Jews are largely ignorant of major parts of the Bible and know some parts only through commentaries that distort meaning. . . . Jewish fundamentalists believe that the Bible itself is not authoritative unless interpreted correctly by Talmudic literature.

So things in Israel are not so comfortable, so stable, so full of "simchas"—the Yiddish term for "joy"—as many (both Jews and Christian supporters of Israel) would like to think or otherwise have the world believe. And this brief review says so very much, again, about what most people don't know about Israel today, particularly in regard to its own internal turmoil and divisions within the Jewish population itself.

But from the perspective of the non-Jewish world, it is the Israeli mistreatment of the Christian and Muslim people of Palestine that has emerged as the major source of concern about the Jewish agenda.

There are, needless to say, many thoroughly-documented works relating the nature of the state of Israel today vis-a-vis the Palestinian question. And fortunately, we must note, some of the most forthright expositions have been the work of Jewish thinkers—even including Israelis—who have come to see the folly of Zionism and its ugly fruits.

One of the most powerful books of recent date by an Israeli is the 2008 volume, *The Holocaust is Over—We Must Rise From Its Ashes*, first issued in Hebrew under the title *Victory Over Hitler* in Israel, but published in English by MacMillan in the United States. The author is Avraham Burg, former speaker of the Israeli Knesset and for many years one of the towering figures in Israel.

The release of Burg's book caused shockwaves throughout Israel and the global Zionist community, directly challenging "The Holocaust" as the center of Israeli (and Jewish) life. A chapter title in Burg's book refers to the Holocaust as being "ever present"—and he meant that in a notably negative way. Burg wrote:

The Shoah [the popular Hebrew term for "The Holocaust"] is woven, to varying degrees, into almost all of Israel's political arguments. Unlike other events of the past, the Shoah does not recede but is coming closer to us all the time. It is a past that is present, maintained, monitored, heard, and represented.

Noting the reality of life today in Israel, Burg goes so far as to suggest that while "Israel was built as a safe haven for the Jewish people ... it is today the least safe place for Jews to live."

And despite the Israeli (and Jewish) dependence upon "The Holocaust" as a foundation for the preservation of Israel, Burg believes that Israel's behavior is a fundamental cause of what is said to be rising anti-Semitism in the world today:

We must admit that present day Israel and its ways contribute to the rise in hatred of Jews.

The responsibility for anti-Semitism is not ours, yet the mere existence of Israel is a thorn in the side of those who do not like us and requires more serious investigation and discussion than the shallow notion that "the world is against us no matter what we do."

Speaking of such attitudes on the part of his fellow Jews in Israel, Burg comments sharply: "Such beliefs are suicidal, desperate, and defeatist. I do not subscribe to them." Burg expresses his dismay at the angry outlook of so many Jews in Israel who seem unwilling to seriously explore real peace with the Christians and Muslims of Palestine:

Israel accentuates and perpetuates the confrontational philosophy that is summed up in the phrase "The entire world is against us." I often have the uneasy feeling that Israel will not know how to live without conflict.

An Israel of peace and tranquility, free of sudden outbreaks of ecstasy, melancholy, and hysteria will simply not be.

In the arena of war, the Shoah [i.e. "The Holocaust"] is the main generator that feeds the mentalities of confrontation and catastrophic Zionism.

The term "catastrophic Zionism"—used here by Burg—is a turn of phrase that is almost exclusively used by Israeli and Jewish writers and one which is largely unknown to even many of those who are familiar with literature relating to Zionism and the issue of U.S.-Israeli relations. But it is a significant term most assuredly. And for the present, we must digress, for this concept requires a more thorough exploration if we are able to understand the underlying crisis that lies within Israel itself.

The concept of "catastrophic Zionism" (which has also been referred to as "war Zionism") suggests that Israel—as a state—relies on crisis and the potential of war with its neighbors as a foundation of its very existence. And, in fact, this has been the belief of many hard-line "right wing" elements going back to the earliest days of Israel as a modern-day political entity.

In short, there are many serious and devoted Zionists who believe that such crisis is vital—fundamental—to Israel's survival. And for this reason, although they are not likely to acknowledge it in any direct manner, the believers in "catastrophic Zionism" will never (under any circumstances) lend their support to any policy (domestic or international) that could lead to a final solution of the conflict between Israel and the native Christians and Muslims of Palestine.

Now, admittedly, this is a difficult theme for many people to understand. People cannot seem to digest the idea that any Jewish person living in Israel (or any Jewish person anywhere who supports Israel) would not want peace, would not want the various aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict to be resolved. But the truth is that this notion—that peace could be dangerous to the survival of Israel—is a governing concept in the minds of many Israelis and their supporters worldwide.

While most rational, fair-minded people would assume (one would say logically) that Israel would prefer to have neighboring states that are stable, successful, profitable participants in the region and in the global community, this is most definitely not the case at all.

In fact, a carefully-crafted “think piece”—entitled “A Strategy for Israel in the 1980s” featured in the February 1982 edition of the World Zionist Organization’s publication *Kivunim: A Journal for Judaism and Zionism*, and penned by Oded Yinon, an Israeli journalist with links to the Israeli Foreign Ministry—candidly put forth, in no uncertain terms, an Israeli strategy to wreak havoc in the Arab world, dividing the Arab states from within.

The program—which amounted to “balkanizing” the various Arab republics, splitting them into religious enclaves in which, for example, Shiite Muslims or otherwise Sunni Muslims would predominate—was an unswerving agenda which Israeli dissident Israel Shahak said, quite simply, was designed “to make an Imperial Israel into a world power,” by disrupting the Arab states and thereby setting the stage for Israeli dominance in the Middle East and for Israel to thus emerge indeed as a major global force all its own.

And, as we said, the entirety of the formula was founded on the idea of creating chaos among Israel’s Arab neighbors, hardly a policy that any decent, well-meaning neighbor could be credited for fostering.

In fact, the insane U.S. war against Iraq has accomplished almost precisely what the strategy paper suggested. And even as this is written, we have heard stories of Israeli efforts to divide the Iranian people among themselves. And this, of course, is just the beginning. There are many other targets of Israel’s wrath.

Note this: Writing in *Time* on Feb. 17, 2003—on the eve of the American invasion of Iraq—one of the most prominent of the American Jewish neo-conservatives in the media, columnist Charles Krauthammer, announced that the impending war was “not just to disarm Saddam. It is to reform a whole part of the world . . . What the U.S. needs in the Arab world is not an exit strategy but an entry strategy. Iraq is the beckoning door . . .” Krauthammer frankly named the targets of the neo-conservative war policy: “Iran, Saudi Arabia, Syria and beyond.”

One day later, on February 18, 2003, the Israeli newspaper, *Ha’aretz*, reported that then-Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon was calling for the United States to move on Iran, Libya and Syria after what was presumed to be the successful destruction of Iraq by the United States—a view no different than that expressed by the aforementioned Krauthammer.

Sharon said: “These are irresponsible states, which must be disarmed of weapons of mass destruction, and a successful American move in Iraq as a model will make that easier to achieve.”

The Israeli newspaper also reported that in meetings with Sharon and other Israeli officials, U.S. Undersecretary of State John Bolton—one of the key “neo-conservatives” inside the Bush administration promoting war against Iraq—had said, in the Israeli newspaper’s words, that Bolton felt that after Iraq had been dealt with “it would be necessary thereafter to deal with threats from Syria, Iran and North Korea.”

In addition, on Feb. 27, 2003, *The New York Times* freely reported that Israel not only advocated a U.S. war on Iraq but that Israel also believed that, ultimately, the war should be expanded to other nations perceived to be threats to Israel. The *Times* stated:

Many in Israel are so certain of the rightness of a war on Iraq that officials are already thinking past that conflict to urge a continued, assertive American role in the Middle East. Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz told members of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations last week that after Iraq, the United States should generate “political, economic, diplomatic pressure” on Iran. “We have great interest in shaping the Middle East the day after” a war, he said. Israel regards Iran and Syria as greater threats and is hoping that once Saddam Hussein is dispensed with, the dominoes will start to tumble.

All of this is particularly interesting since—after the Iraq war emerged as the debacle that it was (and is)—the Israelis and their propagandists in the American media began trumpeting the theme—an absolute lie as demonstrated by the array of preceding remarks memorialized here—that Israel had opposed the U.S. invasion of Iraq.

Much more could be said, but suffice it to say that although Israel is, as we have seen, truly one of the “sick men of the Middle East,” the Jews want to inflict their own sorrows on their neighbors. And in the meantime, Israel continues to panhandle the American taxpayers (and the subjugated people of Germany) for continued infusions of foreign aid grants, “loans” (which are seldom repaid), and all manner of favors and privileges designed to prop up Israel at the expense of others.

However—just for the record—we should point out (and this will surprise many people, even including those who are well-read about the intrigues of Israel) the fact is that there have long been factions within Israel (particularly among the hard-line “right wing” Likud elements) that have openly written about and debated the theme that Israeli reliance on U.S. foreign aid is actually a hindrance to Israel’s greater good and that Israel should move toward adopting policies that would decrease Israel’s need for American subsidies.

In fact, this was one of the propositions put forth in the now-infamous “Clean Break” document—formally entitled “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm”—that was prepared in 1996 by American Jewish pro-Israel strategist Richard Perle and a host of pro-Israel neo-conservatives for the then-ruling Netanyahu regime in Israel. So the bottom line, even in the realm of the issue of U.S. foreign aid, there are many nuances in Israeli policy-making that are not so obvious and cut-and-dried as many (even critics of Israel) might perceive.

This is why the celebrations were certainly premature in the early days of 2011 when newly-elected Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.)—son of respected American non-interventionist Rep. Ron Paul (R-Texas)—called for a cut in U.S. foreign aid to Israel.

What many people forgot was that while campaigning for the Senate Rand Paul had consistently maintained a position in favor of cutting foreign aid to Israel, even at the same time he was rattling the sabre at the Islamic Republic of Iran, parroting the very rhetoric of the neo-conservative supporters of Israel.

So, in a sense, Paul’s position vis-a-vis foreign aid was not really so very different from the neo-conservatives—much as that may be a disappointment to those who perceived Paul’s view on foreign aid to be a breath of fresh air in an otherwise stinking arena.

In any case, U.S. policy toward Israel and Israel’s own attitude toward the world at large remains consistently hinged on that tired old saw known as “The Holocaust.”

The theme of “The Holocaust” and the potential of a future possible mass extermination of the Jews has become the linchpin of Israel’s very existence. But it is not only an underlying theme in Israel. It also extends to American Jews. Of this, former Israeli Knesset Speaker Avraham Burg says flatly: “American Jews—like Israelis—are stuck in Auschwitz, raising the Shoah banner high to the sky and exploiting it politically.”

Burg noted that on one of his first trips to the United States he visited the office of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and saw a poster entitled “Masada—A Living Memory,” referring to the much-heralded story of the purported “last stand” of brave Jews who surrendered

their lives in suicide to the Roman onslaught—another “Holocaust” of the Jewish past. Of this Masada commemoration, Burg asks, “Is collective suicide the contemporary motto of American Jews?”

Another Jewish writer, the aforementioned Joel Kovel—who has become a forthright critic of Israel—reflected on Masada in his 2007 book, *Overcoming Zionism*, pointing out that even the legend of Masada was just that: a legend. Kovel cites Nachman ben Yehuda, a professor at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who has written a book entitled *The Masada Myth: Collective Memory and Myth-Making in Israel* (published by the University of Wisconsin Press). According to ben Yehuda, the so-called heroes of Masada were, in Kovel’s words:

[A] group of robbers and assassins, the Sicarii, who terrorized and massacred Jewish villages, and escaped to Masada after being forced by other Jews to leave Jerusalem. Thus, they did nothing to protect the capital from Roman aggression. Although there were instances of heroic resistance against the Roman legions, none of these took place at Masada, which essentially was a gangster camp, the occupants of which took their lives once the Romans laid siege.

Kovel compares this to the mass suicide by the cult at Jonestown, and suggests (correctly) that Masada is “the myth dear to Israeli identity” and adds cynically that, “whether this expresses a deeper truth about Israel is a matter I leave to the reader.”

And for those who don’t know the significance of Masada to modern-day Israel, note carefully—as even the famed Hollywood mini-series *Masada* pointed out in its epilogue, actually showing live footage of one such event—that newly-anointed Israeli military officers are sworn into their posts on site at the legendary mountain-top “fortress” where they valiantly proclaim: “Masada shall never fall again.”

So mass suicide has been at the foundation of Israel’s national ideology and its defense policy, even to the extent, as we have noted, that the famous “Samson Option”—underlying Israel’s nuclear arms policy—holds that Israel will take the world down with it (in a very real nuclear holocaust launched by Israel itself) if the leaders of Israel ever perceive the nation’s survival is ultimately at stake. Kovel comments:

The culture of ancient Israel produced the first suicide bomber, something that ought to be pondered by Zionist ideologues today when they rant about Muslims resorting to this expedient.

And, of course, from an Israeli point of view, the Holocaust is always at the center of it all. However, Israel's Avraham Burg has been able to look at the ever-present Holocaust and consider it from a new perspective. With some amusement, Burg noted in his book that the Israeli media were outraged by the publication of a British survey, according to which only some 40% of the British public knew about Auschwitz. Burg wrote:

I looked at the data and wondered—not about the 60% who did not know about the history of Europe, of their own people and mine, but about the others, who did know. It is probably thanks to the British media that consistently report and debate the subject.

In a similar ironic vein, Burg pointed out that German politician Joschka Fischer once noted the fact that the new generations in Germany—in order to learn the famous Nazi “goose step”—had to watch British television to find out how it was done, because modern-day Germans didn't know how to do that infamous military step that is so widely commemorated in the Western media.

Burg finds it unfortunate that Jews have segregated their own World War II experiences from those of the rest of mankind during that same period and he noted that “my favorite bookshops in Jerusalem, like in New York, organize their bookshelves so that Shoah literature is one shelf and World War II on another.”

In the 1950s, Burg pointed out, the Knesset passed the “Law for Trying Nazis and Their Collaborators,” the law ultimately used to convict famed Adolf Eichmann, who was charged with “crimes against the Jewish people, crimes against humanity, and war crimes.”

However, Burg believes that the Knesset should strike down the exclusive clause of “crimes against the Jewish people,” because, Burg said, “there are no more real Nazis.”

He added: “Our people should return to be part of the family of nations. We have a section on crimes against humanity and it should suffice. Are the Jewish people not a part of humanity?” And Burg succinctly summarized it all:

Are we present day deniers?
Have we learned our lesson?
Israel and the Jewish people, by expropriating and monopolizing the Shoah, deny all the other mass killings.
It is a denial by means of miniaturizing, dwarfing, and disregarding.

Burg recognizes the irony of Israel's treatment of the Arab Christians and Muslims in the context of the constant memorializing of the Holocaust and asked directly:

Is it any wonder that no one wants to be our friend any more when we practice expropriations, injustice in the military courts, abuse, road blocks, food shortages, and, worst of all, contempt for Arab life? We were so adamant in demanding that the Shoah never happen again that we did not notice what was happening under our noses.

Burg says he has an increasing feeling that many Jews have a “sado-masochistic pleasure” from what was described as “the anti-Semitic wave that swept the world in the early 2000s,” and passes on a word of wisdom to the Jewish people that he believes should be the clarion call of the Jews of Israel (and worldwide) for the future: “The Holocaust is over; It is time for us to rise from its ashes.”

American Jewish writer Joel Kovel reminds his readers of the words of no less than the iconic Mahatma Gandhi, writing of Zionism:

Sympathy [toward the Jews] does not blind me to the cause of justice. The cry for a national home for the Jews does not make much appeal to me. It was wrong and inhuman to impose the Jews on the Arabs. What is going on in Palestine cannot be justified by any moral code of conduct . . . The nobler course would be to insist on a just treatment of the Jews wherever they are born and bred.

As for the Jews in Palestine, I have no doubt that they are going about it in the wrong way. I am not defending the Arab excesses. I wish they had chosen the way of non-violence in resisting what they rightly regarded as an unwarrantable encroachment upon their country. But according to the accepted canons of right and wrong, nothing can be said against the Arab resistance in the face of overwhelming odds.

(Kovel, by the way, has also dared to write of Israel's attack on the *U.S.S. Liberty* and has also referenced the fact of what he described as “behavior most strange, on and around September 11” by Israelis on American soil, which he says, has “been steadily pushed down the memory hole,” but he notes, too, that there has been much discussion of this on the Internet and elsewhere, adding that “All that can be said here is that this much smoke demands a search for fire.”

(Here, of course, he was referring to the fact that several groups of Israelis—later determined to be assets of Israeli intelligence—were seen cheering and videotaping the collapse of the World Trade Center towers on September 11, 2001, another of the little-known details, taken together, which point toward the certainty that Israel did play the front-line role in that tragedy.

In any event, Kovel puts it bluntly, vis-a-vis Israel's treatment of the Palestinian people: "From its beginnings, Israel has been internally compelled to annihilate an existing indigenous society," he writes, adding that "Israel has turned itself into a machine for the manufacture of human rights abuses," and that there has been an "all-pervading ethnocentricity that readily turns racist and is sewn throughout society."

A quite eminent American Jewish critic of Israel (mentioned earlier) Mark Ellis—a university professor of Jewish studies and the founding director of the Center for Jewish Studies at Baylor University—has also expressed deep concerns about trends in Israel, suggesting that in Israel what might be called "Holocaust theology" is emerging as a central force even in religious thinking.

As a leading authority on contemporary Judaism, described as one of the most influential Jewish thinkers of his generation, Ellis—in his book *Judaism Does Not Equal Israel* (published in 2009 by the New Press in New York)—charges that the Jewish establishment uses the Holocaust to quash dissent.

Ellis cited the writer Phillip Lopate who finds the term "Holocaust" to have a self-important, almost vulgar, tone. Lopate said, "Sometimes it almost seems as if the Holocaust is a corporation headed by Elie Wiesel, who defends his patent with articles in the arts and leisure section of *The Sunday Times*." Lopate added: "In its life as a rhetorical figure, the Holocaust is a bully."

Writing of the Israeli treatment of the Palestinians, Ellis says that "after these many years I think the most difficult part of my journey is watching Jews stoop so low in defending the indefensible. That is why I have concluded that we as Jews have reached an end in our history. The question is whether there is a way forward."

Ellis recalled how in January of 1988 an Israeli captain was instructed to carry out arrests in the village of Hawara, outside Nablus. The Israelis gathered up twelve people and Yossi Sarid, an Israeli politician and political analyst, described what happened:

The soldiers shackled the villagers, and with their hands bound behind their backs they were led to the bus. The bus started to move and after 200-300 meters it stopped beside an

orchard. The "locals" were taken off the bus and led into the orchard in groups of three, one after another. Every group was accompanied by an officer. In the darkness of the orchard, the officers also shackled the Hawara residents' legs and laid them on the ground. The officers urged the soldiers to "get it over with quickly so that we can leave and forget about it."

Then flannel was stuffed into the Arabs' mouths to prevent them from screaming and the bus driver revved up the motor so that the noise would drown out the cries. Then the soldiers obediently carried out the orders they had been given: to break their arms and legs by clubbing the Arabs; to avoid clubbing them on their hands; to remove their bonds after breaking their arms and legs, and to leave them at the site; to leave one local with broken arms but without broken legs so he could make it back to the village on his own and get help.

Unfortunately, such descriptions of Israeli behavior are not rare. Rather, they are common-place and reflect precisely what is happening in Israel today. The literature on the subject is shockingly immense.

Israel is not only collapsing internally, with angry dissent among its own Jewish population, coupled with rising political and religious extremism, but its violent attitudes and hostile intentions toward the Christian and Muslim peoples of the region are growing in intensity. Even the public record makes all of this abundantly clear.

And while, of course, the Israelis and Jews worldwide rely on "The Holocaust" as their front-line defense, the truth is that Israel's policies so clearly reflect the very policies that the Jews attribute to the dreaded "Nazis" about whom we continue to hear so much.

With that in mind, as we reflect upon Israel as a failed Jewish state, it is probably appropriate to close here with the quite memorable literary contribution to the debate over Israel by George Steiner whose 1979 novel, *The Portage to San Christobal of A.H.* (published by Simon and Schuster) rocked the world, as so few novels have ever done.

But before we consider this volume, it's important to note precisely who Steiner is. Although he doesn't share the global fame of such writers as Agatha Christie or Steven King or Danielle Steel or other popular novelists whose works have sold in the tens of millions, Steiner has long been considered one of the world's leading intellectuals. A linguist and critic born in Paris in 1929 of Viennese Jewish parents, his works have been translated into eighteen languages.

A frequent contributor to *The New Yorker* and *The New York Review of Books*, Steiner became a U.S. citizen in 1944 and was educat-

ed at the University of Chicago and Harvard and received his doctorate from Oxford where he was a Rhodes Scholar. He wrote for *The Economist* of London and later joined the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton and was a professor at the University of Geneva.

But it was his novel, *The Portage to San Cristobal of A.H.*, that brought Steiner international attention of the type to which even he, so distinguished a figure, had never been accorded before.

This novel tells of the capture of Adolf Hitler in South America in the 1970s. Famed British writer Anthony Burgess called the Steiner's novel "a work of literature . . . an astonishing book." *The Times Literary Supplement* said it was "a fiction of extraordinary power and thoughtfulness." A brief capsule description of the book by its publisher:

Thirty years after the end of World War II, a search party of tough young Israeli Nazi-hunters, some of whom lost their entire families in the gas chambers and ovens, find a wizened, silent old man deep in the Amazonian jungle. He is none other than Adolf Hitler . . . As the world converges on San Cristobal, the Israelis endure an agonizing journey, carrying the Evil One himself out of the jungle to a nervous, waiting civilization.

The conclusion of the book—so powerful, so amazing.

One must read the book (as I first did, some thirty years ago) to understand how remarkable it is.

There is Adolf Hitler standing in the criminal dock, facing trial for his life. Here is what Hitler said, in part, responding to his accusers:

[You say] It was Adolf Hitler who dreamt up the Master Race. Who conceived of enslaving interior peoples. Lies. Lies.

Hitler talks of being educated by one Jacob Grill, described by Hitler as "the son of a rabbi from Poland or Galicia or some place—it didn't matter." Hitler said that Grill was "one of yours, yours, yours. We lived close. One soap sliker between us. It was Grill who taught me, who showed me the words."

And having noted his understanding of Jewish religious teachings, Hitler thereupon puts forward his defense:

It was there that I first understood your secret power. The secret power of your teaching. Of yours. A chosen people, chosen by God for His own. The only race on earth chosen, exalted, made singular among mankind.

The chosen people, God's own and elect amid the unclean, among the welter of nations. Who shall be chastised for impurity, for taking a heathen to wife, who shall have bondsmen and bondswomen among the Goyim, but stay apart.

Hitler told his Jewish tormenters: "Your holy books, the smell of blood." Hitler quoted the Old Testament as to how the Jews were told to deal with The Other:

Put to the sword, the first time, every man, woman, child, she-ox, the dogs, too. No, no dogs. They are of the unclean things that hop or crawl on the earth, like the Philistine, the unclean of Moab, the lepers of Sidon. To slaughter a city because of an idea, because of a vexation over words.

Oh that was a high invention of a device to alter the human soul. Your invention. One Israel. One folk, one leader. Moses. Joshua, the anointed king who has slain his thousands. No, his ten thousands, and dances before the Ark. . . .

I learned . . . from you. Everything. To set a race apart. To keep it from defilement. To hold before it a promised land. To scour that land of its inhabitants or place them in servitude. Your beliefs. Your arrogance. . . .

You have made of me some kind of mad devil, that quintessence of evil, Hell embodied. When I was, in truth, only a man of my time. Oh, inspired, I will grant you, with a certain—how shall I put it?—nose for the supreme political possibility. A master of human moods, perhaps, but a man of my time. Average, if you will.

Had it been otherwise, had I been the singular demon of your rhetorical fantasies, how then could have millions of ordinary men and women found in me the mirror, the plain mirror, of their needs and appetites?

And it was, I will allow you that, an ugly time. But I did not create its ugliness, and I was not the worst. Far from it.

How many wretched little men of the forest did your Belgian friends murder outright or leave to starvation and syphilis when they raped the Congo? Answer me that, gentlemen, or must I remind you? Some 20 million. That picnic was underway when I was newborn.

What was Rotterdam or Coventry compared with Dresden or Hiroshima? I do not come out worst in that black game of numbers. Did I invent the camps? Ask of the Boers. . . .

I have only one more point to make. The last.

That strange book, *Der Judenstaat* [*The Jewish State*, by Zionist pioneer Theodore Herzl]. I read it carefully . . . The language, the ideas, the tone of it. A clever book, I agree. Shaping Zionism in the image of the new German nation. But did Herzl create Israel or did I? Examine the question fairly.

Would Palestine have become Israel, would the Jews have come to that barren patch of the Levant, would the United States and the Soviet Union—*Stalin's* Soviet Union—have given you recognition and guaranteed your survival, had it not been for the Holocaust?

It was the Holocaust that gave you the courage of injustice, that made you drive the Arab out of his home, out of his field, because he was lice-eaten and without resource, because he was in your divinely-ordered way.

That made you endure, knowing that those whom you had driven out were rotting in refugee camps, not ten miles away, buried alive in despair and lunatic dreams of vengeance.

Perhaps I *am* the Messiah. The true Messiah. The new Sabbatai whose infamous deeds were allowed by God in order to bring His people home. The Holocaust was the necessary mystery before Israel could come into its strength.

It is not I who have said it; but your own visionaries, your unravelers of God's meaning when it is Friday night in Jerusalem. Should you not honor me who have made you into men of war, who have made of the long, vacuous daydream of Zion a reality . . .

I took my doctrines from you. I fought the blackmail of the ideal of which you have hounded mankind. My crimes were matched and surpassed by those of others.

The Reich begat Israel.

These are my last words.

The last words of a dying man against the last words of those who suffered: and in the midst of incertitude must matters be left till the great revelation of all secrets.

There are many hard truths in this literary concoction.

And it is a literary concoction, to be sure.

It is not, as some naive folks might presume, some "proof" that Adolf Hitler was a Zionist—secret or otherwise—as much propaganda and misinformation would have us believe today. Nothing—absolutely nothing—could be further from the truth. (And I emphasize that point.)

In this chapter we have covered much diverse and complicated ground, reviewing so many little-known aspects of the reality of the Jewish state of Israel today: immorality, conflict, corruption.

We have, in truth, barely scratched the surface. Much more could be written. This indictment of Israel is, in many respects, incomplete.

However, for the record, let it be said, as I have reiterated so many times in writing and in speaking here on American soil and around the globe over the past 30 years:

Israel is a failed state—a failed Jewish state.

This is said without rancor (and *with* a certain amount of pity).

The thesis is based only on Israel as it is today and which actuality seems likely to remain in place.

Consider Israel in terms of:

- 1) The bitter religious and cultural struggle among Israel's own Jewish population;
- 2) Massive endemic and systemic corruption in Israeli politics and society (a point about which is little-known outside Israel);
- 3) Israel's treatment of the Palestinian Christians and Muslims inflaming the civilized world. Total abandonment of any decency;
- 4) The growing numbers of Arabs and Muslims under Israeli occupation and brutal domination that can only lead to further conflict;
- 5) The intransigent attitude by Israel toward the endeavors of other Middle East states in the realm of nuclear development;
- 6) Israel's consistent refusal to enter into any serious diplomatic agreements from which there can emerge a truly lasting peace;
- 7) The un-ending efforts by Israel to interfere (by covert means and otherwise) in the internal affairs of other nations—intrigues not limited to just its neighbors among the Arab and Muslim states;
- 8) Israel's historic, ideologically-driven agenda of achieving imperial domination of the Middle East as part of a greater long range plan for establishing itself as a power on the global stage;
- 9) The very fact that Israel—as a nation or as a people—has no historic or legitimate claim to the land of Palestine and, as such, has been an artificial construct from its very genesis. Israel is a fraud, a fake, a forgery—a very real abomination based on theft and deception.

And one last critical point that could, in the end—and hopefully so from an American national standpoint—prove to be Israel's undoing:

- 10) The "special relationship" between the United States and Israel, wherein the balance of American political power rests on the fulcrum of Jewish influence, the consequence of which is that the American people have become a worldwide scapegoat for policies that are a direct reaction to the pressure on Congress by the Jewish lobby.

That is, the American treasury—in a time of growing economic turmoil wreaking havoc among our people—is being utilized to underwrite Israel's geopolitical agenda, a point that can only become more clear to growing numbers of Americans as time passes.

And from this, we can only suggest that, ultimately, the American people—when push comes to shove—will (or should) rise up in nationalist fervor and break the back of the Jewish lobby and free the United States from the grip of Israel, bringing the already tottering Israeli house of cards come tumbling down.

There are many voices in the world today clamoring for the deconstruction of Israel and the setting in place of a secular, democratic, pluralistic society and state in which all peoples can secure their liberties and work together to achieve a genuine peace in the Holy Land.

My late friend, former Israeli pioneer Haviv Schieber, called this a "Holy Land State." Others less fervent have called it, in one form or another, "the one state solution."

But there will be a solution—despite what the hard-line Jewish Zionists and their so-called "Christian" Zionist confreres have to say about the matter.

It is an inevitability they must face.

And until the Jews choose to recognize reality, there will continue to be the problem of Israel and it will reverberate at the expense of Jewish people around the globe who continue to insist on the existence of Israel as it is today.

Mark Glenn's book—*No Beauty in the Beast*—is an elegant and eloquent assessment of Israel and its ugly visage, a must read for those who seek an honest picture of the Zionist entity, an accurate and courageous challenge to the framework of lies and mythology relating to Israel perpetuated by the Jewish controlled media.

However, if Zionism—as it has been known during the past 100 years—continues to run roughshod against the course of mankind, we can only expect further violence and hatred and, in the end—God forbid—the destruction of life on our planet.

In the meantime, though, there is—even now—a just solution to the problem of Jewish occupation of Palestine that is too little known about or understood, even by many who are otherwise relatively well-informed about this crisis that looms over mankind.

In the chapter which follows we will explore Birobidjan, the first-ever Jewish state, one which exists today, and which presents, in no uncertain terms, a rational, workable, legal, and moral final solution to the problem of Palestine.

Let us move forward and examine our hopes for Birobidjan . . .

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

Birobidjan: The First-Ever Jewish State An Already Existing Final Solution to the Problem of Palestine

Israel was NOT the first Jewish state established in the 20th Century. That's a fact that only a relative handful of people have known for years, and in recent years Michele, Lady Renouf, a brilliant and beautiful British-based actress-turned-human rights activist has worked to bring the story of Birobidjan—the REAL "first" Jewish state—to the fore. She has written and lectured extensively on the story of Birobidjan and has correctly offered the continuing existence of this Jewish state in East Asia as a possible (and sensible) solution to the ongoing conflict over the Jewish occupation of Palestine. Her website on the topic can be found at jailingopinions.com. What follows is a paper I drafted to help further Lady Michele's efforts . . .

The International Committee For Birobidjan: Dedicated to Nurturing the First-Ever Jewish Homeland and Reaching a Final Solution to the Problem of Palestine

Few people in the world today know that in 1928 there was initiated under the auspices of the Soviet Union a move to create the first-ever modern Jewish state known as Birobidjan (alternately spelled "Birobidzhan") located on the border of Russia and China, not far from the Pacific Ocean. Jews worldwide were invited to come voluntarily to this Jewish homeland, known as the Jewish Autonomous Region, and many did so, including more than 1,000 Jews from outside the Soviet Union.

Birobidjan was the first territorial-administrative entity in the world designated for the Jewish people on the basis of their Jewish nationality. The historic language of the Jewish people—Yiddish—was made the official language of this Jewish state. American Jewish organizations lent their support to this project, including among them "Ambidjan"—the American Birobidjan Committee—whose officials included Albert Einstein and the prominent American Jewish author B. Z. Goldberg.

Today the home of two synagogues, Birobidjan has 77,250 inhabitants. Yiddish theaters opened in the 1970s. Yiddish and Jewish traditions have been required components in all public schools for almost fifteen years, taught not as Jewish exotica but as part of the region's national heritage. The Birobidjan Synagogue, completed in 2004, is next to a complex housing Sunday School classrooms, a library, a museum, and administrative offices. The buildings were officially opened in 2004

to mark the 70th anniversary of the founding of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast. Concerning the Jewish Community of the oblast, Governor Nikolay Mikhaylovich Volkov has stated that he intends to "support every valuable initiative maintained by our local Jewish organizations."

In 2007, The First Birobidjan International Summer Program for Yiddish Language and Culture was launched by Yiddish studies professor Boris Kotlerman of Bar-Ilan University. For the Chanukah celebration of 2007, officials of Birobidjan in the Jewish Autonomous Oblast claimed to have built the world's largest menorah. The Birobidjan Jewish National University works in cooperation with the local religious community. The university is unique in the Russian Far East. The basis of the training course is study of the Hebrew language, history and classic Jewish texts.

The town now boasts several state-run schools that teach Yiddish, as well as an Anglo-Yiddish faculty at its higher education college, a Yiddish school for religious instruction and a kindergarten. The five to seven year-olds spend two lessons a week learning to speak Yiddish, as well as being taught Jewish songs, dance and traditions. The school menorah was created in 1991. It is a public school that offers a half-day Yiddish and Jewish curriculum for those parents who choose it. About half the school's 120 pupils are enrolled in the Yiddish course. Many of them continue on to Public School No. 2, which offers the same half-day Yiddish/Jewish curriculum from first through 12th grade. Yiddish also is offered at Birobidzhan's Pedagogical Institute, one of the only university-level Yiddish courses in the country. Today, the city's 14 public schools must teach Yiddish and Jewish tradition.

This first Jewish state of the 20th Century effectively preceded the birth of the state of Israel in the land of Palestine by more than 20 years. Yet, in 1948, Israel was established, in the wake of much bloodshed and destruction rained upon the Christian and Muslim peoples of Palestine, and since then millions of displaced Palestinians, forced from their homes, have struggled to survive, many living in open-air ghettos that are, for all intents and purposes, no more than what are known as "concentration camps."

This ugly history is well-known to small numbers of peoples across the planet, but still remains a shadow to so many others, particularly Americans.

Michele, Lady Renouf of Britain, has been in the forefront of bringing the story of Birobidjan to the world and she rightly deserves utmost credit for her valiant effort to do so. And so it is only fitting that we conclude by quoting Lady Renouf's assessment of what could be accomplished by a rejuvenated Jewish state in Birobidjan: "By resettling Jews

in the original pre-Israel homeland, Palestine could be restored to its rightful owners, the victims of the 20th century's longest, most notorious and enduring injustice."

We propose the following basic Six Point Program for Birobidjan, subject to consideration and approval by the United Nations:

THAT the United Nations formally recognize Birobidjan as the world's only exclusive, self-governing Jewish state.

THAT the United Nations formally recognize those areas now known as "Israel" "Gaza" and the "West Bank" as the new state of Palestine.

THAT the United Nations provide all necessary assistance for the relocation of Jews now living in the state of Israel to Birobidjan and likewise encourage all nations able to assist in this venture to do so.

THAT all current U.S. foreign aid specifically earmarked for the State of Israel and all German national Holocaust reparations payments made to Israel be redirected to the purpose of airlifting from Palestine all Jewish inhabitants and their relocation to Birobidjan and the transfer to Birobidjan of all of their personal possessions and that aid money be used for the construction of homes in Birobidjan for the new Jewish emigrants to the Jewish Autonomous Region.

THAT for ten consecutive years, U.S. foreign aid money originally earmarked for Israel shall instead be redirected to Birobidjan.

THAT continuing German reparations payments (now being directed to Israel) shall instead be made to Birobidjan.

We believe that this Six Point Program is an equitable and humane proposal that can indeed nurture the first-ever Jewish homeland and bring a final solution to the enduring problem of Palestine.

Respectfully submitted, on this 6th Day of June, 2009.

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

And so we have thus presented what I believe is an equitable solution to the problem of Palestine—even to the ubiquitous and historic problem of anti-Semitism itself.

The Jewish state of Birobidjan offers a formula for the perpetuation of a Jewish homeland that all Jews worldwide can consider a lasting refuge, a land to which they can journey and establish themselves—within secure borders—as a separate people who can share in the fruits of human existence here on earth through the means of cooperation, not domination.

Perhaps one day all of the Jews of the world will one day take their place in Birobidjan and the ever-present problem of anti-Semitism will finally be resolved. And that is as it should be.

Those Damnable Double Standards: The Mass Media's Misrepresentation of the Problem of Anti-Semitism

You are damned if you do. And you are damned if you don't. That's pretty much the way in which the issue of "anti-Semitism" is framed. As we said at the outset: it is the Jews who feel that they—and only they—have the right to define anti-Semitism and to discuss the subject under the parameters they deem appropriate, whether it is related to the issue of Israel, the Holocaust, the Jewish political agenda—any matter whatsoever that is even peripheral to the concerns of the organized Jewish community.

A perfect example of this came in a Jewish Telegraph Agency report of January 8, 2011 reporting on the horrific shooting in Tucson, Arizona of Rep. Gabrielle Giffords (D-Ariz.)—a Jewish congresswoman—and 18 others (six of whom died). The report noted:

The first Jewish woman elected to Congress from [the state of Arizona], she made her Jewish identity part of her campaign. "If you want something done, your best bet is to ask a Jewish woman to do it," said Giffords, a former state senator, said at the time. "Jewish women—by our tradition and by the way we were raised—have an ability to cut through all the reasons why something should, shouldn't or can't be done and pull people together to be successful."

The honest-to-God truth is that if Giffords' opponent had somehow introduced the subject of his own Christian religion into the campaign there would have been a major hue and cry and he would have been accused of "anti-Semitism" and "bigotry." Yet Giffords was permitted—even praised, as we see here, coming from a Jewish source—for having introduced her own religion into the campaign as a reason for voting *for* her. And if that is not hypocrisy, then what is?

I risk a lot by pointing out this out, considering the near-martyr status of this unfortunate victim of violence, but the truth it is. And, as you can see from what I have written in these pages and in all of the other voluminous writings I have put forth over the past 30 years, I've never been one to avoid facing hard facts, no matter the consequence.

This type of hypocrisy and double standards in the media has long run rampant and is well worth discussing at this juncture, precisely because of the fact that Jewish control of the mass media is growing ever more consolidated. And with the rise of tensions in the Middle East

and the dangers that accompany that conflict, people must be all the more vigilant in being assured of having access to accurate information from which they can make sound political judgments.

And in that regard, let it be said simply: Jewish control of the mass media must be broken. The Jewish domination of the media has, in many respects, become the foremost tool of Jewish power on the planet today (rivalled *perhaps* only by Jewish control of the Federal Reserve System).

So let us examine just a few notable instances of how the mass media has contributed to so much misinformation (and so much trouble) in its coverage of Jews and anti-Semitism in general.

While, of course, the subject of "The Holocaust" has always been a favorite topic of emphasis in the mass media, constantly reminding the non-Jewish world of its "duty" to the Jews, in recent years, of course, it was the 9-11 terrorist tragedy that added what might be called a "new dimension" to the debate over the role of Israel (and Jewish influence) in the American popular discourse.

And, as we shall see, those damnable double standards have always been in perpetual play.

Following the 9-11 terrorist attacks the media went into a frenzy anytime anyone, however innocently, suggested that U.S. support for Israel might have played a part in instigating disdain on the part of the Muslim world toward the United States. It was generally implied, if not charged outright, that such a viewpoint was "anti-American" and "anti-Semitic" and not a proper contribution to the debate.

However, let us consider what might be called "the other side of the coin." We refer to the little-known fact that there were actually those persons—and there were many—who said that the 9-11 attacks on the America happened *because the United States had not been as supportive of Israel as it should have been*.

For example, on March 4, 2002, one of Israel's most devoted American Christian supporters, Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), said in a speech to the Senate that God allowed terrorists to attack the United States on Sept. 11, 2001 to punish America for being too tough on Israel.

In a speech condemning his fellow Republican, President Bush, who then was (believe it or not) perceived to be pressing too hard on Israel, Inhofe stated in no uncertain terms:

One of the reasons I believe the spiritual door was opened for an attack against the United States of America is that the policy of our government has been to ask the Israelis, and demand it with pressure, not to retaliate in a significant way against the terrorist strikes that have been launched against them.

Although American broadcast media had previously attacked speakers from the Muslim world who had suggested, in one fashion or another, that the Sept. 11 attack on the United States was the will of God, there was hardly a mention anywhere of Inhofe's inflammatory remarks. It certainly did not receive the attention it should have.

Inhofe's idiocy and lack of attention to detail is almost hilarious. This same senator also sought to explain (in another Senate speech) that the native Palestinians have never had a historical right to Palestine and that when they were there, he said, they contributed little to the region.

In this regard, Inhofe quoted the 18th century French philosopher Voltaire as describing the Palestine of his day as being a "hopeless dreary place." However, what Inhofe—in his bias in favor of the Jews—seems to have ignored is what Voltaire also said on another occasion: "While the Arabs are distinguished by courage, hospitality and humanity, the Jews are cowardly and lecherous, greedy and miserly."

And another 9-11 related example of media cover-up, hypocrisy and double standards is also worth relating in this context, demonstrating further that the Jewish-controlled mass media will not hesitate to suppress news that would provide its audience with a different perspective regarding events of the day, particularly when that information could reflect in a negative way upon Israel and its supporters.

Readers will recall the great anthrax scare that came in the wake of the 9-11 attacks. And it was a "scare" that scared me personally because the Washington, DC post office that was victimized, with the death of one of its employees through exposure to anthrax, was the very post office that serviced the daily mail of my own employer, *American Free Press*. On one occasion, I personally called the police department to investigate a mysterious white powder that I found in one of the plastic mail bins delivered to our office from that post office.

In any case, although we are not likely to ever know whether the officially accused anthrax terrorist Bruce Ivins—a U.S. government-connected scientist—really committed suicide as the FBI says he did, there were two particularly interesting aspects of that case that were buried by the mass media in America.

First of all, even before Ivins was finally determined to be the "real" anthrax terrorist, the government and the media focused attention on another U.S. government-connected scientist, Steven Hatfill.

Although Hatfill was eventually cleared (and later won a multi-million dollar settlement for his troubles), the Jewish-controlled mass media never reported a point that many independent investigators (largely Internet-based) had dared to note: the fact that Philip Zack—a Jewish U.S.-government-connected scientist (with peripheral ties to Hatfill) was

a very real suspect in the crime, believed to have been trying to frame a Muslim colleague for the anthrax attacks.

However, once Hatfill was exonerated, the official investigation (and the media) continued to ignore the Jewish suspect and instead focused on Ivans who then was said to have committed suicide.

Although page after page of excruciatingly detailed information about Ivins' personal life and career appeared in the major newspapers, the "big secret" about Ivins was blacked out: he was a virulent Muslim-bashing supporter of Israel, a Christian by faith who trumpeted the mantra that the Jews are "God's Chosen People."

The Jewish Telegraph Agency acknowledged on August 4, 2008 that these facts about Ivins were, in its words, "significant" because the notes accompanying the anthrax sent to various locales were designed to appear as though they were written by "a radical Islamist," featuring such rhetoric as "Death to America, Death to Israel, Allah is Great."

The JTA article, published in Jewish community newspapers across America, revealed that the *Frederick (Maryland) News Post* had recently republished several letters that Ivins had written to that newspaper over the previous few years, including one in which Ivins praised a rabbi for refusing to engage in dialogue with a Muslim cleric. Ivins wrote: "By blood and faith, Jews are God's chosen, and have no need for 'dialogue' with any gentile."

But no major media in America took note of these revelations regarding Ivins' ideology that even the JTA acknowledged to be "significant."

And, at that time, it was hardly even noted on the Internet. A Google search on August 17, 2008 of the terms "Ivins" and "God's chosen" indicated only 564 references. (However, after I publicized this matter in *American Free Press*, the story spread and as of April 8, 2011 there were more than 15,000 references to be found!)

A similar search at that time of Google's "news" section indicated only four references to this story—and none of those references were in *The Washington Post*, *The Washington Times*, *The New York Times*, *The Los Angeles Times* or any other "mainstream" daily newspaper.

Clearly, the masters of the media determined that American newspaper readers had the right to know the most personal details of Ivins' life, but chose not to permit those readers to know of the pro-Israel ideological fervor that drove Ivins to mask his murderous attacks as the work of Muslim terrorists—if indeed Ivans *was* the guilty party.

After all, knowledge of this might have caused Americans to raise questions as to whether other acts of terrorism—ascribed to "Muslims"—were really the work of Muslims but instead "false flag" measures by Israel and its adherents to turn Americans against Muslims.

And if Ivins *was* involved in the mailing of anthrax-laden letters after 9-11, was he acting alone or at the behest of others? The entirety of the scenario remains a mystery. What we do know is that the Jewish-controlled media was not telling us everything we needed to know.

This aspect of the Jewish-controlled media suppressing information that might reflect badly upon the Jews is, of course, nothing new. But perhaps the most repugnant example of this comes with the media's insistence that organized crime in America is an Italian-American phenomenon, one that has been memorialized in such films as the genuinely-magnificent (but historically inaccurate) "Godfather" series of films, not to mention many lesser copy-cat endeavors from Hollywood.

As I pointed out in my book, *Final Judgment*, the primary top-level forces in organized crime in America have *always* been Jewish, most notably the infamous Meyer Lansky in association with such worthies as Las Vegas tycoon kingpin Morris Dalitz, Chicago crime chief Hyman Lerner (the real power behind such figures as famed "Mafia" boss Sam Giancana) and others.

Even the legendary Al Capone, as I noted in my book, *The New Babylon*, was himself no more than a well-paid (if colorful) front man for Lansky and his partners, the Jewish Bronfman family of Canada. Those interested in the details can read those books that I have cited.

But I don't ask my readers to take my word on these matters. The truth about the organized crime syndicate in America goes much higher and deeper and in directions the mass media has consistently ignored. This point has been well made—if nonetheless unreported by the Jewish-controlled media—in *Supermob*, a fascinating and disturbing fact-filled book published in 2006 by Bloomsbury.

Crafting his much-larger story in the framework of a biography of famed mob attorney-fixer Sidney Korshak who began his career as a functionary of the Jewish-controlled Chicago mob and who later rose to become a key figure in the national crime syndicate figure intimately involved in the affairs of the Hollywood motion picture industry, the author—veteran investigative journalist Gus Russo—assembled a remarkable study of this "Kosher Nostra" that unleashed some little-known facts that are worth recalling here for the historical record:

- That no less than Ronald Reagan owed his early career in the entertainment industry and later his political career in California to a group of gangsters (many of them of Russian Jewish—not Italian-American—origin) who started out in Chicago and in other Midwestern cities such as Cleveland and Detroit. Russo tells the story as it's only been hinted at before, delineating Reagan's close and career-long association (and friendship) with Korshak and a host of other criminal intriguers.

- That this group of gangsters and their associates, including union officials, attorneys, real estate developers, construction tycoons, hotel kings and military contractors—among other wheeler-dealers—played a major role (open and not-so-open) in the development of the casino industry in Las Vegas and in the rise of the motion picture industry as we know it today. Russo tells the story of the wide-ranging (even "legitimate") connections of this sordid group that Russo's book refers to as "America's Hidden Power Brokers."

- That during World War II—and in the years that followed—this tightly-knit clique utilized its contacts in the federal Office of Alien Property to grab control of vast amounts of real estate and other assets that belonged to Japanese-Americans who were taken into custody by the Franklin Roosevelt administration and put in concentration camps on American soil. At the end of the war, one of the Supermob's "inside" men, David L. Bazelon—later a said-to-be "distinguished" federal judge—was responsible for steering this confiscated property—now worth literally billions of dollars—into the hands of this crime-connected network.

Let it be noted that once you've read Russo's account of what happened to the Japanese-Americans, you'll find it difficult to continue listening to the complaints about the confiscated properties of Jewish people in Europe (many of whom are living in Israel today) without recalling Russo's expose of how Jewish-American gangsters and their "respectable" Jewish associates (many of whom emerged as key supporters of the Israeli lobby in the United States) managed to amass billions of dollars in confiscated Japanese-American property.

Russo's book demonstrates how this Jewish crime syndicate branched out into the complex and inter-connected worlds of finance and industry with the Jewish mob always lurking in the background. And as Russo points out, the deeds of this Jewish crime family resulted in repercussions that "were felt by practically every American of their era," not the least of which was the rise of Ronald Reagan to the presidency, setting the stage for much of the intrigue across the planet today.

While in the public realm, Italian-American names have predominated in newspaper headlines and in filmland, the truth is, as Russo makes clear, this Supermob—this small handful of Jewish figures of Russian origin—"often pulled the strings of the visible power brokers" and yet, ironically, "most Americans never heard of any of them," Russo writes:

Through deniable, often arm's-length associations with the roughneck Italian and Irish mobsters imprinted in the popular imagination, the Supermob and the hoods shared a sense of entitlement regarding tax-free income.

This "Kosher Nostra" stressed brains over brawn and evolved into a real estate powerhouse, an organized-labor autocracy and a media empire. If power does, indeed, corrupt, then the Supermob corrupted absolutely.

Through methodically nurtured political ties, the Supermob effectively insulated itself from prosecution. They were above the law . . . They propelled the making of the movies we watched, the music we listened to, the politicians we voted for, and the hotels and resorts we frequented.

Likewise, although the facts have been strictly ignored by the mass media—which lionizes former New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani as "America's mayor"—15 long years before Giuliani became a household name as a consequence of his vaunted role in New York following the 9-11 terrorist tragedy, I had occasion to write in *The Spotlight* newspaper about Giuliani, outlining what was the very real "big secret" about Giuliani's status as a "crime buster" during his earlier tenure as U.S. attorney in Manhattan, prior to becoming mayor of the Big Apple.

What Giuliani actually accomplished was to shut down decades-old, home-grown and largely-decrepit Italian-American criminal groups, setting the stage for foreign-born (primarily Jewish) gangsters—mainly from Russia but also including many from Israel (Giuliani's favorite foreign nation)—to take over the operations previously controlled by the Italian organizations.

The Jewish-controlled New York press entertained their readers with exciting stories about the famed "Five Families" of the Mafia as Giuliani and his prosecutors launched a showy campaign that sent an assortment of high-ranking "bosses" off to prison, largely old and graying gentlemen whose day in the sun had long passed.

Meanwhile, as the media (and Giuliani) were focusing on "the Mafia," Jewish crime groups from Russia and Israel were beginning to flourish in the New York area (and elsewhere in America), perfectly positioned to fill the vacuum left by the demise of the old-time Italian syndicates.

The popular daily tabloids—*The New York Post* (owned by Zionist billionaire Rupert Murdoch) and *The New York Daily News* (owned by Mortimer Zuckerman, who once served as the president of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations)—helped make Giuliani a high-profile figure.

They hailed his courtroom combat with the old Italians, often pointing out the irony that it was an Italian-American who was bringing down the bad guys. But what the tabloids didn't mention was that the Jewish crime bosses were moving into the void.

While a few independent media sources did mention over the years that Sam Kislin—a Ukraine-born and now New York-based patron of Israel repeatedly linked to high-ranking figures in the "Russian" mob—raised more than \$2 million for Giuliani's intended (but aborted) bid for the Senate in 2000, the pivotal part that Giuliani played in destroying the Italian mob in New York—thus paving the way for the aggressive takeover of the New York rackets by the non-Russian "Russians"—was a sensitive area even many "alternative" journalists preferred not to address.

And the record shows that there was absolutely no question that elements inside the federal law enforcement community in the New York area at the time Giuliani was the big man on the scene were deliberately turning their eyes from the burgeoning activity of the "new" mobsters in the New York criminal underworld.

Most of the Jewish criminals arrived in New York from the Soviet Union when, in the early 1970s, the Soviet KGB emptied its jails of many of these hard-core criminals and allowed them to come to America in the much-hailed release of Soviet-Jewish "émigrés."

The initial base of operations for the Jewish (so-called "Russian") mob was the Brighton Beach area in Brooklyn, where vast numbers settled, establishing their own enclave.

In the early 1990s alone, there were said to have some 300 "members" operating there—these numbers being larger than any of the more-publicized Italian-American Mafia "families" that Giuliani took to task. However, Giuliani and the Justice Department "crime busters" who set the stage for the "Russian" takeover essentially looked the other way.

The late highly-independent Jewish-American journalist, Robert I. Friedman, wrote in his book *Red Mafiya* that one of the leading figures in the "Russian" (i.e. Jewish) crime syndicate, Shabtai Kalmanovitch, was also an operative for Israel's Mossad.

In addition, Friedman pointed out, other figures in the "Russian" syndicate, such as Joseph Kobson, had close political ties with (indeed strong influence over) the "right wing" Likud political bloc in Israel.

Friedman's indictment of Israel's entwinement—as a nation—with the "Russian" mob was telling indeed. Friedman wrote:

With two decades of unimpeded growth, the Russian Mafiya has succeeded in turning Israel into its very own 'mini-state,' in which it operates with virtual impunity.

Although many in international law enforcement believe that Israel is by now so compromised that its future as a nation is imperiled, its government, inexplicably, has done almost nothing to combat the problem.

Friedman emphasized that U.S. law enforcement—including the FBI—did little to impede the growth of the “Russian” crime syndicate while it was establishing itself on American soil. The reason, he said: “A large part of the problem was political: the Russian mob was predominantly Jewish.” Friedman revealed that as far back as 1992, an FBI spokesman, Joe Valiquette, admitted that “The Russian mafia has the lowest priority on the criminal pecking order.”

Concurrently, Patrick Cotter, one of the Justice Department prosecutors who nailed famed Italian-American crime figure John Gotti, frankly admitted to Friedman that “if we don’t begin to address the problem now, we’ll be running around asking ourselves how the hell this Russian organized crime got so big and how we can get rid of them.”

Cotter noted that while the FBI had squads targeting what were then the declining Italian-American “crime families,” there was no squad targeting the “Russian” crime figures. “There is your problem,” he said.

The outspoken prosecutor noted further that “The Russians started bringing in Israelis.” And of the “Russian”-Israeli alliance in New York organized crime, Cotter said, “Their main thing is drugs. They are very, very tough. These guys are trained professional soldiers, and they are not afraid of anybody, including the Italians.”

What Cotter failed to say was that the gangsters were—and are—protected by the most powerful political force in the United States today: the Jewish lobby, represented by such groups as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith, a documented arm of Israel’s intelligence service, the Mossad, as well as the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee.

The mass media, largely controlled by Zionist interests, has also redirected attention away from these elements.

Considering all of this, it’s interesting to note that *Moment* magazine—which describes its focus as “Jewish politics, culture, religion”—featured a July/August 2008 cover story entitled “Who’s Your Godfather? How Some Jews are (Proudly) Rediscovering Their Gangster Roots.”

The article cited one Ron Arons who has made a business of helping Jewish Americans find out who the gangsters were in their family. According to *Moment*, “these days, it’s almost cool to be related to a (dead) Jewish mobster,” and that, citing the aforementioned Arons, “there’s a criminal in every Jewish family.”

So God’s Chosen People—both in the United States and Israel—have become almost worshipful of a particular Jewish occupational tradition that might not be so highly regarded by others. But, again, we’ve seen how the Jewish-controlled mass media has proven itself quite skilled in covering up facts such as these.

Another remarkable aspect of how the Jewish-controlled media has distorted political discussion in America on behalf of Jewish interests—again in reference to the ever-present problem of corruption—comes in the context of the media’s coverage of the so-called “election reform” proposals of Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) who later, of course, was the Republican Party’s failed presidential candidate in the 2008 election.

Although McCain (and his legislation) were regularly hailed throughout the media, there was much more to the story, but only readers of some Jewish newspapers got to know the truth.

Following the 2002 elections, when this legislation—shepherded into law by McCain and Jewish Sen. Russ Feingold (D-Wis.)—went into effect, the New York-based *Forward*, perhaps the most respected Jewish community newspaper in America, bragged in its first post-election edition that “Jewish interest groups may be the big winners” under the newly-passed legislation. *Forward* stated flatly in no uncertain terms:

Political hands say groups such as the Republican Jewish Coalition and its counterpart, the National Jewish Democratic Council, not-for-profits unaffected by the ban on “soft money” for political campaigns, are poised to be big beneficiaries of the new [campaign finance legislation] regime.

In fact, under the McCain-Feingold “reform,” the new strength in organized Jewish political power would come at the expense of corporations, labor unions and other interest groups—and wealthy individuals, too—who were previously exempt from regular limits on campaign contributions if their funds were donated directly to national party organizations for “party building,” voter drives and issues advertisements.

Under the new law only so-called “issues” groups such as the aforementioned Jewish organizations would not be subject to limits. *Forward* pointed out that: “As long as the groups are independent of the parties and candidates do not ‘coordinate’ their activities with them, their contributions remain unrestricted.”

What this meant was that a wide-ranging number of political action committees focused on Jewish and Israeli interests could now spend unlimited amounts of money working to elect or defeat candidates.

Now although top Jewish organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith and AIPAC target offending politicians for destruction, these organizations do not formally involve themselves in election campaigns or donate money to candidates.

However, it has long been an “open secret” that dozens of Jewish political action committees which do legally donate money to candidates

rely on "a wink and a nod" from the ADL and AIPAC to determine whom they should support or oppose financially.

Anyone familiar with the history and record of McCain (described in my book *The New Babylon*) would not be surprised that McCain should be the one responsible for enacting such legislation. McCain owes his entire career to the sponsorship of the powerful organized-crime-enriched family of billionaire Edgar Bronfman, longtime head of the World Jewish Congress. McCain's chief backer in Arizona politics, Kemper Marley, was a front man for the Bronfman family, and McCain's own family beer distribution fortune came through this connection.

Another instance of media distortion (of a more historical nature) that I have noted in several previous works, but which is worth noting again, comes in the media (and academic) reportage relating to the so-called "Know Nothing" movement of the mid-19th Century. Although we are consistently told that this movement was "led by Protestants" and "aimed at Catholics and Jews," the record shows that one of the foremost high-ranking leaders of this movement was a Jew, Lewis Charles Levin.

Not only one of the Know Nothing party's founders but also an editor of its national organ and in 1844 one of the first Know Nothing members elected to Congress, Levin was *the first Jew elected to the U.S. Congress* and there he served three terms until defeated for re-election in 1850.

Born in Charleston, South Carolina, which—as informed students of the Jewish-controlled slave trade know well—was the Jewish population center of the United States for many years, long before New York City emerged as such, Levin moved north, as an attorney, to Philadelphia where he launched his anti-Catholic political career.

The fact a Jew was one of the premier anti-Catholic agitators in America is interesting, to say the least, since history has been careful to "edit" the record as far as Levin's role in the Know Nothing movement is concerned. Levin's career has been consigned to the Orwellian "Memory Hole" and studiously suppressed even by most Jewish historians.

In this same vein, as often as we hear about Christian persecution of the Jews, in ancient Roman times the Jewish persecution of the early Christians was so intense that the imperial Roman government issued mandates protecting the Christians from Jewish persecution.

A particularly revealing book, *The Jews in Imperial Roman Legislation*—published in 1987 by Wayne State University Press in conjunction with the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities in Jerusalem and edited by Amnon Linder, an assistant professor of history at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem—contains numerous translations of Roman edicts condemning Jewish harassment of the early Christians, the fact of which has likewise been suppressed by a media that would rather

focus upon Christian persecution (real or imagined, and often exaggerated as we have seen earlier in these pages) of the Jews.

So the absolutely undeniable truth of the matter is that the earliest recorded persecutions (involving Christians and Jews) related to Jews persecuting Christians—and not vice versa.

Likewise, although we have often heard time and again of the infamous and legendary "blood libel" wherein the "Evil Christians" have accused the "poor persecuted Jews" of using Christian children in violent religious rituals, we learn from David Rokeah, associate professor of classical history and Jewish history at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, that, in fact, *the first accusations regarding so-called "ritual murder" were actually made by the Jews against the early Christians!*

Rokeah's remarkable revelation—which is not likely to be featured on the national news any time soon—appeared buried in his essay "The Church Fathers and the Jews" which was published in *Antisemitism Through the Ages*, edited by Shmuel Almog, director of the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism, which issued that volume (in conjunction with Pergamon Press) in 1988.

This frequent Jewish tactic of accusing others of what they (the Jews) are in fact guilty of has been aptly described as "accusatory projection" or "accusatory inversion." I wish I had coined those terms myself.

And we should note that an Italian-Israeli Jewish historian, Ariel Toaff, professor of medieval and Renaissance history at Israel's Bar Ilan University, set tongues wagging when, in 2007, he issued his book, *Passovers of Blood: The Jews of Europe and Ritual Murders*, which documented that, in fact, there was genuine evidence Jews had practiced ritual murders just as many critics of the Jews had long contended.

The son of the former chief rabbi of Rome, Toaff could hardly be accused of being an anti-Semitic agitator, and in response to the Jewish outcry he initially withdrew his book from circulation. However, he later reissued the book, having carefully edited its pages, suggesting that while the charges of ritual murder being practiced as a common Jewish tradition were simply "anti-Semitic" propaganda emanating from Christians, that it was likely that *some* Jews did, in fact, engage in the crime.

So Professor Toaff wanted to have his bagel and eat it too, so to speak. But the fact that he published the book in the first place, written as it was, and the resulting uproar from the Jewish community that occurred, probably says more about the truth of the matter than what Toaff (and needless to say, the Jews as a group) would now have us believe.

And as far as Jewish-Christian relations are concerned, on a general basis—far removed from such esoterica as ritual murder—we must take a closer look at the manner in which the mass media (yet again) works

relentlessly to assure us that "Jews and Christians are really very much alike" and—more particularly—of how America, especially, is steeped in a so-called "Judeo-Christian tradition."

This so-called "Judeo-Christian" tradition is often hailed as the foundation of American support for Israel, of course, but it goes far beyond that. It is forever being thrown in the faces of Americans as an explanation of why challenging Jewish power politics is just simply wrong and as a reminder that the Jews are God's Chosen People whose agenda is not to be rejected in any way, shape or form.

However, the historical fact about the origins of the term "Judeo-Christian tradition" is something that so few know about, despite the fact that it is a ubiquitous turn of phrase that is ever present, always before us.

We are indebted to Jewish-American historian, Dr. Peter Novick of the University of Chicago, for the truth of the matter. In his 1999 book, *The Holocaust in American Life* (published by Houghton-Mifflin), Novick reveals in no uncertain terms that the catch-phrase referring to "the Judeo-Christian tradition" was a product of wartime propaganda concocted for political purposes and had no foundation in historical reality or in the annals of either Jewish or Christian teaching.

According to Novick, "It was during the Hitler years that American philo-Semites invented the 'Judeo-Christian tradition' to combat innocent, or not so innocent, language that spoke of a totalitarian assault on 'Christian civilization.'" In short, the term was invented for the very purpose of disposing of the concept that there was any such thing as "Christian civilization" in the first place.

Even during wartime, Novick points out, the official American government (and also, to a degree, Jewish community) propaganda against the Germans downplayed German treatment of the Jews. According to Novick, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith was very fearful Americans would blame Jews for the war. Immediately after Pearl Harbor, the ADL's director warned that, "There will be hundreds of thousands of bereaved families, a substantial part of whom have been conditioned to the belief that this is a Jewish war."

Novick revealed that Leo Rosten—a Jewish writer who headed the Office of War Information's special anti-German propaganda division known as the "Nature of the Enemy" department—was fearful of putting too much emphasis on Nazi atrocities against Jews.

Rosten and the Jewish leadership perceived that there was so much anti-Semitism in the ranks of the U.S. Army that the result would be that U.S. soldiers might be sympathetic to the Germans.

According to Rosten: "The impression on the average American is much stronger if the question [of fighting Hitler and the Nazis] is not

exclusively Jewish." With that in mind, according to Novick, U.S. propagandists were directed to show that the Nazis were "everyone's enemy, to broaden rather than narrow the range of Nazi victims."

In short, the phrase touting "the Judeo-Christian tradition" was no more than wartime propaganda. The concept is an outright fraud—a sham—that has nothing whatsoever to do with any theological teaching, popular modern-day perception notwithstanding. This casts a new light on a much-abused turn of phrase that is practically obligatory in all public pronouncements touching on the subject of religion in America.

So it is that although the American Jewish community has played a major role in fighting traditional American displays of religious devotion, the invented concept of "the Judeo-Christian tradition" has still been a useful propaganda tool in perpetuating what really is nothing more than what can be rightly called Jewish propaganda.

And yet despite the insistence upon the purported existence of this "Judeo-Christian tradition," we have seen already (and putting it lightly) that Jews really don't care that much for their Christian brethren.

In his book *Esau's Tears* (cited earlier), Jewish historian Albert Lindemann—an acknowledged authority on "anti-Semitism"—pointed out that, in recent years, Jewish journals "have been full of broodings and lamentations about what some Jews have termed 'the bloodless holocaust' of intermarriage and assimilation or what others consider the 'curse' of friendship that is replacing the older curse of enmity."

Citing Rabbi Shlomo Riskin, who in his weekly column in *The Jerusalem Post*, said it was an "open question" as to whether Gentile friendliness or anti-Semitism was worse for the Jews, Lindemann also noted how famed legal giant Alan Dershowitz, a self-appointed defender of his people, described Jews in America as having been "seduced"—as distinguished from being "raped" in other times and places.

This great paragon of Jewish virtue, Alan Dershowitz, was defense attorney for Jewish Defense League terrorists who murdered, in a bombing, the Jewish secretary for Sol Hurok, the Jewish impresario who offended the JDL by bringing Soviet performers to America at a time Jews were raging about purported Soviet anti-Semitism. Dershowitz also worked on behalf of an Orthodox rabbi, worth more than \$100 million, who abused elderly patients in nursing homes. He is certainly quite a model for students of the Talmud, this fellow Dershowitz.

A leading Dershowitz critic is rambunctious Jewish-American dissident, Dr. Norman Finkelstein. His 2005 book *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History*, (published by the University of California Press) takes Dershowitz and other Jewish leaders in America to task for their fervent devotion to what is factually their

exploitation of anti-Semitism (both real and imagined).

Finkelstein points out that in 1974 the Anti-Defamation League's Arnold Forster and Benjamin Epstein published—what Finkelstein called “to great fanfare”—their book *The New Anti-Semitism* and then, less than a decade later, the ADL's Nathan Perlmutter put out *The Real Anti-Semitism in America*, talking about a whole new raft of anti-Semitism that was screaming across the country and which described Israel as “the issue central to our beings.” Not America—but Israel.

Now, of course, Finkelstein points out that once again, Jewish leaders in 21st Century America are talking about an even newer “new Anti-Semitism” said to be raging on U.S. shores and around the globe. Of the professional anti-anti-Semites, Finkelstein wryly notes:

Were they not able to conjure up anti-Semitism, Abraham Foxman [of the ADL] and Rabbi [Marvin] Hier of the Wiesenthal Center would face the prospect of finding real jobs. In the cases of Foxman and Hier this would be a real tragedy: both get paid nearly a half a million dollars annually from their respective “charitable” organizations.

Describing the phenomenon of what he calls “crying wolf,” Finkelstein notes “many claims of anti-Semitism prove on investigation to be wildly overblown or fabricated,” and cites numerous examples including one notable instance: the story of a yarmulke-wearing Jewish student at Yale University being attacked by a Palestinian in his dormitory. However, Finkelstein asserts: “No one at Yale's Center for Jewish Life or the university administration had ever heard of such an assault.”

In fact, independent researcher Laird Wilcox has documented—in his provocative *Hoaxer Project Report*—that many reported instances of “anti-Semitism”—involving nasty words scrawled on bathroom walls and painted on synagogues and other unpleasant outrages—have actually been outright hoaxes, *most of them actually perpetrated by Jews*.

(Earlier I described how a synagogue in my hometown was vandalized to much outcry about “anti-Semitism.” However it turned out—but it was not reported in the press which had expressed so much interest in the matter—that the crime had been committed by the son of the rabbi.)

Wilcox has also assembled a revealing volume, entitled *The Watchdogs*, which explores the activities of such groups as the ADL and the Southern Poverty Law Center, demonstrating that their surveillance and targeting of not just “extremists” but any and all others who dare to have any political ideas at all reaches into a realm of behavior that has little relationship to what we might simply call “American tradition.”

So the big question that arises is this: how much “anti-Semitism” is there really? Although there's no question that many people throughout history have had serious questions about Jewish behavior, Jewish power politics, Jewish religious practices, and, more recently, the actions of the Jewish state of Israel, it is a matter of very real debate as to whether “anti-Semitism” is as rampant as the Jews would have us believe.

It often seems that, on the one hand, the Jews want us to believe that all is “hunky dory” and that everyone absolutely loves the Jews, on the other hand—or so they say—anti-Semitism (if it isn't running roughshod) is always somewhere lurking, hidden below the surface. If anything, it is often downright confusing. The Jews never seem precisely certain—at least by their written and spoken rhetoric relating to the matter—as to what they believe about anti-Semitism or about what they want non-Jews to believe about this subject, their favorite topic bar none.

There has been in recent times, though, a most remarkable and candid volume that takes the subject of anti-Semitism to a new level. Entitled *The Paradox of Anti-Semitism*, the book (published by Continuum in 2006) asserts (and seeks to document) that “hatred of Jews can be a positive force in Jewish history” and that “anti-Semitism and Jewish survival are . . . intrinsically interconnected.” The author, American-born Rabbi Dan Cohn-Sherbok, a professor of Jewish theology at the University of Wales, is described as “one of the world's leading authorities on Judaism.”

The rabbi contends that Jewish assimilation and entry into the non-Jewish world has been a danger to the survival of Jews as a people and that although anti-Semitism is an evil that must be fought, he says that “in our increasingly secular and scientific age, we need to acknowledge its paradoxical power to renew and enrich Jewish life.” The rabbi says that “in the absence of Jew hatred, Judaism is undergoing a slow death.”

Considering what the rabbi has so openly acknowledged, perhaps we can now understand why, over the years, there have been ugly rumors (and they aren't just “rumors” by the way) about Jewish groups such as the ADL deliberately orchestrating “anti-Semitic” outrages: vandalism of synagogues and Jewish cemeteries, those vulgar scribbles on bathroom walls (a favorite!), and other measures designed to scare Jewish folks into rallying 'round the Star of David.

The story is that even Arnold Forster, a longtime ADL “macher”—that's Yiddish for “big shot”—was once caught by a police officer, paintbrush in hand, tarring a New York synagogue with a swastika!

In fact, it is worth examining the role of the ADL—along with intertwined elements in American intelligence and law enforcement—in their role in stirring up trouble (including violence), all of which has been part and parcel of the problem of anti-Semitism as we know today.



TWO OSWALDS—TWO McVEIGHS? Ten days after the Oklahoma bombing, a “right wing” Israeli terrorist, 28-year-old Sharon Toval, was arrested in New York and deported to Israel. The one known photograph of Toval (top center) shows someone who—without beard and mustache—could be mistaken by a stranger for accused bomber Tim McVeigh (top right) and also bears a likeness to the famous “John Doe No. 1” image (above left) that authorities initially released after the bombing and which was used to implicate McVeigh. In fact, McVeigh’s attorneys were said to have been looking into the possibility “right wing terrorists” from Israel had a hand in the bombing. This postcard (shown below) featuring a famous Depression-era photograph, titled “Black Sunday” (which had been the name of a well-known 1977 Hollywood film about terrorism), was mailed—inside a hand-addressed envelope—to the Washington office of *The Spotlight* newspaper from Oklahoma City on April 17, 1995, two days before the bombing. An original caption on the photo noted “Dust Storm Approaching . . . April 14, [19]35.” The postcard arrived at *The Spotlight* the day after the bombing and was immediately turned over to the FBI, which was more interested in trying to implicate *The Spotlight* in the bombing than investigating who had sent the card, which clearly indicated foreknowledge of the bombing. The handwriting on the envelope was not that of McVeigh or his alleged co-conspirator, Terry Nichols. The card’s existence is proof positive of a very big plot by Zionist-run Judas Goats to implicate anti-Zionist forces in that horrible tragedy. At bottom right is ubiquitous “white separatist” attorney Kirk Lyons who played a strange role in the Oklahoma affair.



CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

Close Encounters of the Worst Kind: Agents of Jewish Intrigue in the American Nationalist Movement

Although it’s a popular myth—particularly in American “patriot” circles—that politically active people who are said to be “anti-Semitic” are actually on the payroll of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith, that’s not precisely correct.

But it sure makes a good conspiracy theory.

And if truth be told, there have been more than a few fools, over the years, who have asserted that I am an “ADL agent.” Anyone who knows me (and there are many who do) knows full well what nonsense that is, particularly in light of my personal history as I’ve outlined it in these pages, but then, again, it sure makes a good conspiracy theory.

However, there is one interesting example which illustrates how the ADL (and, in this particular case, in alliance with the FBI) has indeed manipulated one “right wing hate group.”

In my book, *The Judas Goats*, which documented the long and ugly history of the infiltration and disruption of the American nationalist movement by the ADL and collaborating elements in American law enforcement and intelligence, I told this story:

As early as 1974, David Duke—then a rising star in the white racialist movement in America and leader of a faction of the Ku Klux Klan—spotted one of his lieutenants, Bill Wilkinson, as being “trouble.” Duke was attempting to “reform” the KKK movement, so to speak, and “clean up its image” and to counter the media stereotype that KKK members were violent haters.

In fact, precisely as Duke suspected, for the final eight months of his membership in Duke’s Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, Wilkinson was acting as a paid informant for the FBI and its collaborators at the ADL.

And although Duke warned people Wilkinson was not to be trusted, Wilkinson went on to found his own Invisible Empire of the Ku Klux Klan after splitting with Duke. And for eight years that followed, Wilkinson managed to dupe many innocent folks in the “Empire” who had no idea that Wilkinson was actually working for the FBI.

However, once Wilkinson was ensconced as leader of his own (FBI-sponsored) Klan group, Wilkinson worked assiduously to build up a public profile as a KKK leader spouting angry rhetoric and hinting of violence through such slogans as “Guns, Guys and Bullets,” thereby stirring up increased racial tension. Wilkinson’s antics thus assisted fundraising efforts by the ADL which pointed to Wilkinson as a growing “threat,” when, in fact, he was under the thumb of the ADL’s allies at the FBI.

Writing in *The Thunderbolt*, Dr. Edward Fields described one thing about Wilkinson's FBI-sponsored Klan which demonstrates precisely how Wilkinson was also working on behalf of the ADL:

Another interesting item is that the FBI urges all of its informers to do their best to protect Jews by urging patriots not to criticize them. When Bill Wilkinson sought to hire the professional right-wing writer Bill Grimstad, he first insisted that Grimstad promise to stay off the Jewish issue.

Grimstad refused and said in that case he didn't want the job as editor of Wilkinson's paper. At the same time, Wilkinson has time and again urged guest speakers at his rallies not to criticize Jews.

So although the FBI sponsored anti-Black rhetoric, anti-Jewish rhetoric was "off limits." In any event, in 1981, Wilkinson's role as an FBI informer while "leading" his own KKK was publicly revealed, effectively ending Wilkinson's career in the "right wing," but the revelations finally convinced many that there were indeed Judas Goats within the ranks of American dissident groups, a bitter pill for many to swallow, but a warning that many still seem to have failed to properly heed.

In *The Judas Goats* I also had occasion to write of my own experiences with—and knowledge of—"ringers" inside a variety of American nationalist groups, many of whom were otherwise widely hailed by their friends and associates as sterling individuals beyond reproach. Foremost among them, of course, as I mentioned earlier in these pages, was no less than Roy Bullock, the number one longtime undercover informant for the ADL.

My experience with Bullock is worth recounting here in its entirety for it does illustrate the manner in which Jewish agents operate—although, for the record, I should point out that Bullock was not Jewish, but was nonetheless, for many years, a valued ADL asset.

As best I can recall, my first encounter with Bullock came sometime probably in 1983. As the junior staffer in the editorial department of the national populist weekly, *The Spotlight*, published by Liberty Lobby, I was frequently delegated to attend to visiting readers who ventured to Liberty Lobby headquarters. Through this, of course, I had occasion to meet many hundreds of *Spotlight* readers of all sizes, shapes and colors. And one of them, it turned out, was a likeable and engaging chap from San Francisco named Roy Bullock.

A middle-aged man with thinning dark hair and a flamboyant handlebar mustache, Bullock spoke in a measured baritone voice, with an

inherent hint of cynicism. Short, stocky, barrel-chested and powerfully built with the shoulders of a professional wrestler, the bull-necked Bullock carried himself with an erect military bearing. Although an art dealer by trade, Bullock, ironically, could easily be cast by a Hollywood director as a soldier of fortune fighting in some far corner of the world.

A witty conversationalist with a merry smile, a twinkle in his eyes and a hearty laugh, Bullock was highly inquisitive and would be the life of any party. A teetotaler, Bullock was a vegetarian and very much a health enthusiast. Once when having lunch with Bullock and another of my *Spotlight* colleagues, I noticed that Bullock carried a large amount of cash in big bills. His expenses, of course, were provided by his ADL paymasters. He always insisted on paying the dinner bill for his prey, certainly a benefit for me, considering my own pathetic pay scale.

When I first met Bullock, I recall that he mentioned that he was in town for some meeting or other of an Arab-American group. In early 1984 Bullock returned to Washington and made a visit to Liberty Lobby once again. This time he asked for me and I was pleased to renew our acquaintance. Bullock was very much interested in the newly-founded Populist Party which had been established by Liberty Lobby.

Roy was full of questions—a lot of them.

It was at that point I realized that he was *unusually* full of questions, more so than most "regular" *Spotlight* readers.

Now this is an important point: as a Liberty Lobby staff member, I had regular occasion over the years (as I mentioned) to meet with hundreds—if not thousands—of our supporters. They were always full of questions and comments and I expected that. Liberty Lobby's supporters were intelligent people who were looking for answers.

But 99.999% of them—unlike Roy Bullock—weren't looking for "gossip." I realized that the kinds of prying questions that Bullock was asking had nothing to do with facts about political events, the populist position on issues of the day, or any other such matters.

Bullock, in fact, was looking for gossip—garbage—dirt about people in the populist movement.

It was at that juncture that it passed through my mind that Roy Bullock may well have been an informant for the ADL. And so, in my own way, I thought I would have some fun with him. I mentioned the ADL. I actually complained to him that the ADL never mentioned me.

"After all I have done to fight the ADL," I commented, "they don't pay me any notice!" Bullock chuckled with delight. After a short visit, he went on his merry way.

It wasn't long after that—perhaps several months later—that Bullock turned up again. I was called to the front office to see a visitor.

Sitting on the divan in the lobby was none other than Roy Bullock. I greeted him cheerfully, shook his hand and welcomed him back to Washington. "I have something that will interest you," said Bullock. "Hot off the press," he added, handing me a sheath of papers. "I just picked it up in New York." It was an ADL report on the Populist Party and there was *my name* mentioned among other Liberty Lobby personnel who were involved in the party's affairs.

I shouted with pleasure: "The sons of bitches have finally mentioned my name." It was a badge of distinction, I thought then—and still do. (But, in truth, I realized now that I had "crossed the line" and was on the ADL's radar and that it was "too late" to turn back.)

Bullock, I noticed, was watching me carefully. Very carefully.

It was at this moment that I realized that my suspicions might be on the mark: Roy Bullock was an agent of the ADL! If he wasn't, I thought, he should have been.

Frankly, at that moment, I wasn't sure just how to react, but I once again expressed my delight. "The last time I saw you," Roy said, "you were complaining that the ADL hadn't ever mentioned your name. Well, now they have." *At this point I was certain that Bullock was most likely an ADL operative.*

I didn't see Bullock again, as best I can recall, until the early part of 1985. I had been invited to attend, along with Populist Party National Chairman Bill Baker and our colleague, *Spotlight* correspondent Trisha Katson, a meeting sponsored by the Washington-based Libyan Students Association. It promised to be an entertaining evening. Strolling into the banquet hall, I heard the sound of exotic Arabic music in the background. There—already—was Trish Katson and Bill Baker and an assortment of other friends and acquaintances, including a fellow by the name of Matthew Peter Balic, more about whom later.

Bill Baker was eagerly introducing several American Indian leaders to the gathering. I joined the party, taking a seat at the table where Baker was holding court. As Baker entertained his listeners with an amusing anecdote, I saw a familiar face entering the room. It was none other than Roy Bullock. I stood up and beckoned him to the table, pleased by his arrival, but intrigued nonetheless. Bullock was everywhere. Everywhere that an ADL agent should be.

He spotted me and strolled over. "Somehow I thought I might find the Liberty Lobby crowd here," he chortled, shaking hands. "I could feel the vibrations," he noted, raising his eyebrows as he glanced from left to right, affecting a comic shiver. He joined us at the table and the conversation, inevitably—considering the occasion—turned to the Middle East question.

I watched Bullock carefully. I sensed something "not right." He was listening, laughing at the appropriate moments, watching the others as carefully as I watched him.

At one point I interjected what I hoped was a rather biting witticism that cast aspersions upon the state of Israel and its leaders. As the others laughed in amused agreement, Bullock joined in the laughter. But his laughter was not sincere. "Yessss . . ." he hissed in agreement.

But it was obvious that he didn't agree. In fact, I realized, Bullock was being quietly—but very clearly—sarcastic. And he couldn't contain himself. I saw the flash of distaste in his eyes. He was playing a role—just barely. No one else noticed, but I did.

And by now it was increasingly clear to me that there was indeed a lot more to Roy Bullock than met the eye. I had no firm evidence, of course, but I was more convinced than ever: Roy Bullock was indeed an agent of the ADL.

As best I can recall, I saw Bullock next in September of 1985, again in Washington. Bullock stopped by Liberty Lobby and advised me that he was going to be attending a meeting of the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee and it just so happened that an Arab-American friend of mine, the wonderful Dr. Sam Cross, had given me two tickets to a breakfast being held during that conference.

And so it was that my colleague and dear friend, the late Lois Petersen, and I sat with Bullock and several others at that breakfast gathering at the Arab-American meeting.

(It was only years later I also found out that sitting at our table was an American spy for Saudi Arabian intelligence (!) although, at that time, he had no idea that Roy Bullock was working for the ADL.

(In 2005, in a personal letter to me from the Saudi spy, he told me of his affiliation and that he recalled dining with Bullock and Mrs. Petersen and me.)

In any case, following the breakfast, we parted company. Roy had been his ebullient self—as always—but I was ever more convinced that I was dealing with the Devil!

Of course, it was only my gut instinct and at the time I was still relatively young and hardly any veteran in dealing with The Judas Goats—The Enemy Within. I was in no position to make any accusations about Bullock but my suspicions were strong.

It was in the late part of 1985 or early in 1986 that Bullock next made contact with me when in Washington. He wanted to attend the annual conference of the California-based Institute for Historical Review (which had been founded by Willis Carto of Liberty Lobby) and his application had been rejected. He asked if he could use my name as a

reference. I told him "Go right ahead," since, after all, I did not want to rouse his suspicions by saying, "no," because, obviously, he and I had always had friendly contact up until that time.

What I did not know, at that time, was that Willis Carto had already been informed, by Dr. Edward R. Fields of *The Thunderbolt* newspaper, that Bullock was an ADL agent. And it was for this reason that Bullock's application to attend the historical conference had been rejected by Willis Carto himself. I didn't hear from Bullock again in regard to the matter, and Willis and I didn't discuss it—until later . . .

In any case, it was sometime soon, in the spring of 1986, that Bullock once again popped up in Washington. He called and asked if I would like to have dinner with him. Although I was obviously wary about the matter—by now convinced in my own mind that Bullock was certainly an ADL agent—I agreed to meet him for dinner.

But I thought it was time to mention Bullock to Willis Carto who, fortuitously, happened to be in Washington. I was scheduled to have dinner with Bullock at 6:00 pm.

So about 5:00 pm when the Liberty Lobby office was winding down for the day, I stopped in Willis's small corner office. Bullock had told me, when I first met him, that he had known Willis "for years," so I opened up the conversation with Willis, saying:

"Willis, you know Roy Bullock, don't you?"

Willis looked up, a twinkle in his eye and a hint of a smile. "Yes, how do you know him?"

"Well, he's been coming around here for the last couple of years," I said, "In fact, I'm having dinner with him tonight."

Willis was still smiling.

"Tell me about him," I prompted, sensing—no, knowing—that, yes indeed, I was right about Bullock. I *knew* what Willis was about to say:

"He's ADL."

That was it. I nodded my head, smiling, but inside my stomach was churning. I was certainly dismayed, but at the same time I was mentally patting myself on the back for having spotted the enemy in disguise.

"I thought so," I said.

At that juncture Willis asked me the same question I was asking myself: "What have you told him?"

"I don't think I've told him anything that I shouldn't have. But then," I added, honestly, "I'm not sure."

"Where is he now?" asked Willis.

"He's going to be here very shortly. We're supposed to have dinner across the street. Do you think I should cancel?" I asked, uncertain, obviously, about the situation.

"Not necessarily," he responded. "You know," said Willis, thinking aloud, "maybe this is an opportunity for us to find out precisely what he's interested in."

"What do you mean?" I asked, somewhat puzzled.

In response, Willis proposed that I should indeed have dinner with Bullock and then, frankly, tell him that I had been told that he had "connections" with "people at the ADL" and ask him, "What exactly is it that you'd like to know?"

Bullock, of course, would have been surprised by all of this—presumably—and at that point I would offer to tell him whatever he wanted to know (within limits) in return for Bullock using his connections at the ADL to determine something of particular interest to Willis: i.e. who was responsible for the July 4, 1984 bombing of Willis's office (and his warehouse of valuable historical books) in Torrance, California.

Willis' proposal made good sense to me, and I thought that, at the very least, it would be a very good learning experience for me—facing down the Devil, literally across the dinner table.

So it was that I jaunted off to my dinner with Roy.

We went to a popular Capitol Hill nightspot called the Tune Inn, perhaps best known for having been hailed by *Esquire* magazine as one of the "best" bars in the entire republic. A narrow, old-fashioned barroom, complete with stuffed animals decorating its walls, along with a few choice pieces of weaponry, the Tune Inn had been a rough-and-tumble "joint" that evolved into a yuppie favorite, filled in the evenings with Capitol Hill staffers eagerly spending their taxpayer-financed salaries on some of the lowest-priced drinks in the nation's capital.

Roy and I took a table at the rear of the inn, ordered drinks and dinner and settled down for what I knew would be an interesting evening. Roy, of course, ordered a soda. A two-fisted drinker, I ordered something much stronger, thinking, still, that I would have to keep my wits about me. But I did need to relax.

Staring across the table observing Roy Bullock, I saw him in a different light. He wasn't the jovial, friendly, amusing and likeable acquaintance of several years. Instead, he was the Devil incarnate. "My God," I remember thinking, "Here's Mike Piper having dinner at the ADL's expense, in the company of one of its covert operatives."

Hardly a moment after the drinks arrived, Bullock began quizzing me. It *was* quizzing. *Determined* quizzing. Not friendly chat. Now there was no doubt in my mind. "Tell me," he asked, raising the name of another individual who—like Bullock—was quite ubiquitous, showing up at various and sundry political events of the same type. "Who is this chap? He's a rather interesting sort. Where is he coming from?"

Bullock was referring to one Matthew Peter Balic (mentioned earlier), an unusual figure—now dead, as of 2010—who had periodically popped up at Liberty Lobby headquarters over the years, and, like Bullock, he had an affinity for attending Arab-American meetings.

"Oh, him? I've always suspected he might be an ADL operative," I said, quite seriously. (Inwardly I was surprised at my own brass. I had actually broached the subject of the ADL!)

"Oh? Do you think so?" cooed Bullock.

"I think it's a good possibility," I said. "He's always showing up, mixing with the Arabs. He travels a lot. Spends a lot of money." (I realized, of course, that this precise description fit Bullock!)

Either Balic was an ADL agent or an agent of some sort and Bullock knew it—and was trying to find out if I had any suspicions—or perhaps the ADL really wondered who Balic really was.

Alternatively, I was thinking, perhaps Balic was an ADL agent whose Bullock's ADL superiors had never told him about. That seemed wholly possible in the clandestine so-called "wilderness of mirrors" in the strange world of the ADL. In any case, Bullock was definitely interested in Balic and I had given him a choice morsel to report to his superiors at ADL headquarters in New York: that Liberty Lobby's Mike Piper suspected Balic of being an ADL agent!

(In fact, as we discovered—a decade later—Balic was an intelligence operative of the Church of Scientology which had, itself, been taken over from within by a group of Jewish lawyers who were themselves acting as agents of Israel's Mossad and using the considerable outreach and resources of that church to advance the international Jewish Agenda, in defiance of the interests of genuine and loyal members of the church. That's another story for another time, but suffice it to say that the mysterious Mr. Balic was just as much a Mossad asset as Roy Bullock, but in a far different and perhaps even more sinister way.)

In any case, there at the Tune Inn, my conversation with—rather my interrogation by—ADL asset Bullock continued. Bullock got down to business. "This bombing [of the Institute for Historical Review] was a rather interesting affair," he said. I practically jumped out of my seat. I could feel my blood boiling. I was certain that Bullock must have seen my reaction. Or was it my imagination?

Somehow—was it an accident?—Bullock had brought up the very topic of my own covert assignment. Finding out what Bullock knew—or could find out—about the bombing of Willis Carto's office.

("My God," I thought. "Is the Liberty Lobby office bugged? Did the ADL hear the conversation that Willis and I had engaged in earlier? Did the ADL tip off Bullock as to what was afoot?")



This photograph was taken at a meeting in Washington, DC of the Libyan Students Association (described in this chapter). Shown from left to right are ADL undercover asset Roy Bullock, Michael Collins Piper, anti-Zionist journalist Phil Collier, former Populist Party National Chairman Bill Baker, and Matthew Balic, an undercover asset of the Church of Scientology, which (by that time) had, unfortunately fallen under the control of Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad. It was around this time Michael Collins Piper had definitely concluded that Bullock was an operative of the ADL. Balic's own ties to Israeli intrigues were later unmasked.

We chatted about the bombing, but in my own mind, Bullock had thrown up a roadblock. It was as though he had deliberately preempted me—and *he knew I knew it*. I resolved that it wasn't the time to spring Willis's proposal on Bullock. I was ill-prepared, I felt—unskilled, unlike Bullock—to engage in this game of cat-and-mouse, not knowing what Bullock did or didn't know about what I knew, or suspected.

We concluded the evening after dinner with several drinks at a restaurant down the street where I encountered a congressman of casual acquaintance. I introduced him to Bullock and vice-versa, knowing full well that Bullock was making a mental note to tell his boss at ADL headquarters in New York, Irwin Sull, that "Mike Piper is personally acquainted with Congressman So-and-So." (I've always felt guilty about that. There's no question in my mind that, in the unlikely event the ADL didn't have a file on that congressman, a harmless soul who has since left office, they certainly do now!)

Bullock and I parted company, shaking hands and agreeing to "keep in touch." ("Indeed," I thought, wondering when I would next hear from Roy Bullock, ADL agent extraordinaire.) In fact, I did not hear from Bullock for some time, under circumstances shortly to be detailed.

But finally the moment came when it seemed appropriate to publicly blow the whistle on Bullock's ADL affiliation, this at a time when the Populist Party—which Liberty Lobby set in motion in 1984—had been split down the middle through the destructive activities of a long-time trouble-maker in third party affairs, one William K. Shearer of Lemon Grove, California. Shearer himself had long been suspected of being an ADL asset or in the employ of the FBI—even the Republican Party, some guessed. Whether the real truth about Shearer (who has since died and gone to Hell) will ever be known remains to be seen.

However, on June 30, 1986 in an article in *The Spotlight*, I detailed Bullock's ties to Shearer. The relevant portion of the story read in part:

At the so-called "national committee meeting" of the Populist Party conducted by Shearer in Los Angeles . . . one delegate, who goes by the name of Roy Bullock, was invited to serve on the agriculture committee.

Bullock has long been known, among leaders in the populist movement, to be a charming, skilled and clever full-time professional operative for the ADL. Posing as a populist, Bullock has, over the years, wormed his way into dozens of different organizations, collecting information he reports to Irwin Suall, his superior at ADL headquarters in New York.

Shearer's wife was warned at the meeting by California Populist Charles Ulmschneider that Bullock was a known ADL operative. But instead of showing Bullock the door, she approached him and told him of the charge. Bullock was permitted to remain.

Not long after the *Spotlight* article unmasking Bullock as an ADL operative, I received a call from someone who identified himself to the switchboard operator as "CSC." Taking the call, I recognized Bullock's voice immediately—and I was startled, needless to say—but was even more somewhat mystified by the acronym he used to identify himself.

Recovering from my momentary jolt, I said, "Well, hello Roy, I'm surprised to hear from you. But what does 'CSC' mean?" He laughed, saying, "CSC—that's for charming, skilled and clever." I laughed. "Oh yes, Roy, that you are. I thought you might appreciate that compliment."

He said, "Well, I have to tell you that what you said about me, being an ADL agent, is not true. In fact, I swear on a stack of *Mein Kampf*s [Adolf Hitler's famous volume] that I'm not an ADL spy."

I chuckled about Roy's reference to Hitler. But he continued in a more serious tone, saying, "I've talked to a lawyer about this."

"Well, Roy, if you want to file a lawsuit," I responded, "you'll have to go ahead and do it, because I stand behind the article and I know that my source on that is reliable. In addition, I had suspected it myself for some time, a long time, prior to the time that it was published. We sat on that for a long time."

He responded, asking, "Well, who was your source?" I responded, truthfully, "Willis Carto." Bullock chuckled, making a remark to the effect that Willis was not the most reliable source. I replied, "Well, I wouldn't expect the ADL to consider Willis a reliable source. But I've always found him reliable."

Bullock said, "I'm sorry that you wrote that. I've always liked you. I thought we were friends." I said, "Well, Roy, I've always liked you, but I do believe that you are an ADL agent."

After Bullock commented laughingly, "Oh, and by the way, my name really is Roy Bullock. I don't just travel about under that name," we closed the conversation and it ended at that. No lawsuit was ever filed.

A few folks around the country were quite upset that I had dared to call "a fine patriot like Roy Bullock" an ADL agent. And so it remained. It took nearly eight years before that passing reference in *The Spotlight* to Bullock's ADL affiliation was proved accurate—that Bullock truly was a paid agent of The Enemy Within.

This came at the time when, at the end of 1992, the San Francisco newspapers had been forced by circumstances to unveil the now-infamous ADL spy scandal (referenced earlier in these pages) that had enmeshed Bullock and his ADL superiors. For the full details of that remarkable series of events, I refer readers to my book *The Judas Goats*.

After a week or two of observing the reportage by the San Francisco papers, I decided that it was time to "reach out and touch someone," namely my old friend, Roy Bullock. And so I did, dialing his telephone number (still in my rolodex) with some trepidation, I admit.

"Hello, is this Roy Bullock?" I said, somewhat hesitantly, when I heard the familiar baritone at the other end of the telephone.

"Speaking," he responded quite confidently.

"Hello, Roy," I said. "Are you still as charming, skilled and clever as you were when I knew you?"

"I'd like to think so," he responded.

"Do you know who this is, Roy?" I asked. "It's Mike Piper."

"Oh yes," he acknowledged. "I recognized your voice immediately. How have you been?"

"Oh very busy," I responded, adding, "and I guess you have been, too. I've been reading quite a bit about you in the papers lately," I said, not sarcastically, just frankly.

"Oh yes," he sighed. "But not all of it is true."

"I didn't think so," I commented in agreement, recognizing that the Establishment media has a flair for reckless inaccuracies.

"It seemed to me," I told Bullock, "as though there was a lot of supposition, a lot of guessing, that the full story hasn't been told."

"That's certainly true," he said. Then, after a pause, Bullock remarked in a wry tone with a hint of some resignation: "Well, Willis was right about one thing, anyway," referring, of course, to Willis's allegation regarding Bullock's status as a long-time covert ADL operative.

"Actually, Roy," I pointed out, rather proudly, I suppose, "I figured you out even before Willis tipped me off."

"Ohhhh? You did, did you?" said Bullock, just a bit sarcastically.

"You know," I told him, "my feeling was that you were primarily interested in Arab groups."

"Oh no," he said. "Not at all." (Which, of course, proved to be very, very true. Bullock and the ADL, in fact, were interested in *everybody*.)

"I figured that you were interested in finding out if we had any connections to the Arabs, which, of course, we don't," I added.

And then I said: "I have to tell you, Roy, I always had this feeling that you rather enjoyed wallowing with people of my ilk, so to speak."

There was a momentary, but quite noticeable, silence—a sudden coolness coming through the phone.

I realized that, quite innocently and on the spur of the moment, I had actually put my finger on something that Bullock would have never admitted to himself, but which, I believe, was very much a part of his psychological make-up: in fact, he *did* revel mixing with my ilk.

"On the contrary," he responded, a little too sharply and not with the confidence that he was trying to convey.

"Although," he added, "I must say you were always a bright spot in an otherwise dismal group of people. I always enjoyed your company. I had hoped that perhaps you would jettison all that schlock and do something positive with your life."

I chortled at Bullock's comments. "No, Roy, I do think I'm doing something positive," I said in response. "I entered this arena knowing what it entailed and I don't have any regrets."

"Well, no hard feelings I hope?" he said, sincerely, I felt, even hoped, having been rather kindly disposed toward Roy.

"Not at all," I said. "Not at all. You were doing your job, and I was doing mine." (Which was quite true.)

"It's been good talking to you again after all these years," he said. "I'm actually glad you called."

"Yes, I've enjoyed it," I said. "It's been fun. So I guess maybe I should

close for now. I hope." (I added, in my own way, not insincerely) "you won't be getting in trouble over all of this."

"I don't think I will," he said. But it was clear that Bullock was not enjoying the situation.

"Well, good luck to you, Roy. It's been interesting," I concluded.

"You take care," he closed. "It's been good talking with you."

It had been interesting. I hung up the phone and pondered the situation. Roy Bullock was indeed an ADL operative and I had been in his clutches. Talking the matter over—sorting out the truth, so to speak—had been a form of therapy for me. I had confronted the enemy.

The next day I informed Willis Carto that I had called Bullock. "No kidding?" he asked, laughing, somewhat amused at my audacity. "What did he have to say?" I related the conversation as Willis chuckled.

I really don't know what ever happened to Bullock after the ADL scandal receded into memory. Perhaps I'll call him again—and find out.

But as I said, Roy Bullock was not the only such character that I encountered in my—shall we say—"adventures in anti-Semitism," for want of a better way of describing it. There was another such individual who definitely bears mention here for the record: Kirk Lyons, an attorney who was a busy figure operating in the "white separatist" movement and in "Southern heritage" organizations for some 20 years or more.

While Lyons' star essentially faded long ago (and rightly so) he still pops up now and then and despite much public discussion of his enigmatic record, there are still those who hail him as the second coming of Robert E. Lee, largely because Lyons has made a small career, in recent years, of defending students who wish to wear Confederate flags on their tee-shirts, something even the American Civil Liberties Union has made one of its pet causes—a point many of Lyons' defenders (who still cling to him as a "leader") often seem to miss.

For the record, I should probably note precisely how I came to be suspicious of Lyons in the first place. These details demonstrate that sometimes one's own instincts are one's best guide. And in some respects they do recall my own initial suspicions of Roy Bullock.

While, over a period of years, beginning in the mid-1980s, I had heard many great things about Lyons, including some glowing accounts from a number of my own personal friends who had met up with Lyons, I never had any memorable interaction with him, although I vaguely recall that, in the earliest years of Lyons' heyday, I may have met him briefly on some occasion, the specifics of which I long ago forgot.

In fact, in a relatively short time after he first emerged on the scene, Lyons had immersed himself in "nationalist" and "populist" and "white separatist" affairs—even including some association with so-called

"Holocaust deniers"—and always seemed to be somewhere. Lyons was rising up as a "big man" in the circles in which he was quite energetically operating and he was very much considered by many to be a real asset to "the movement," largely on the basis of the fact that he was a "gen-U-ine" attorney willing to represent "controversial" clients.

However, even though I don't recall my first personal encounter with Lyons, I will never forget the time that my suspicions of Lyons first arose. For some reason, I happened to be at home in the middle of a weekday afternoon and I received an excited phone call from a friend advising me to tune in to one of those silly programs—along the lines of Geraldo Rivera or Sally Jesse Raphael—that enjoyed featuring "Evil White Racists Live and in Person."

Whatever program it was happened to have some such folks on display—part of the media's ever-recurring effort to demonstrate the evils of racism and, of course, "anti-Semitism."

Turning on the television I stepped out of the room and—while not watching—I listened to the guests in question as they enunciated their assorted points of view. One unfamiliar voice went on at some length about his "white separatist" standpoint.

But as I listened, I realized that, in my perception, this individual was either (a) using a lot of rhetoric he didn't fully understand or—and this was my primary impression—that (b) he didn't really believe what he was saying and that, in some very real way, he was a fraud, a phony, a deceiver; that perhaps he was even indeed the proverbial "plant."

Unnerved by this, I stepped back to the television and to my surprise—really my shock—I discovered that the speaker in question was none other than the much-heralded Kirk Lyons.

Afterward, I related—with some notable distress—my observations to Willis Carto who counseled me (probably wisely at the time) to keep my suspicions under wraps since Lyons was ostensibly a "friend" of my employer, Liberty Lobby, the populist institution that published *The Spotlight*. Obviously—no matter how certain I was of my own instincts—it would have been unwise to make any accusations based on something so speculative and subjective. So the matter rested.

However, about six months later, as part of my duties as a *Spotlight* editor, I was asked to do a transcription of a two-hour interview with Lyons who had appeared on Liberty Lobby's nightly radio forum, *Radio Free America*, with host Tom Valentine (a good and decent man, I should say for the record). Over a period of years I had transcribed probably many hundreds of—probably well over a thousand—such interviews that were published regularly in *The Spotlight*, often covering two or more pages in the body of that newspaper.

However, after listening to—and struggling over—the interview with Lyons, over a period of more than three hours, I found that I simply was unable to commit to the computer more than a handful of lines from Lyons. (Contrast that, for example, to a similar two-hour interview with British historian David Irving that ended up filling roughly four full pages of *The Spotlight* with endless facts and substantive information!)

So despite my extensive experience in transcription of a wide variety of interviews with a wide variety of personalities discussing all manner of topics, ranging from health to history to taxes to conspiracy—you name it—I was unable to find anything of value or substance in what Lyons had said over a full two-hour interview!

My reaction, again, was precisely what it had been before. Lyons just wasn't for real—and that was reflected in what he said (or didn't say, as the case may be) during that interview with Tom Valentine.

So I came to believe, even more strongly, that my instincts were absolutely on the mark. But I will be the first to assure you, here and now, that I realize that my instincts were not "proof" of anything.

However, in the years that followed, I began to hear bits and pieces from a number of folks (who were not necessarily in touch with one another) who felt that Kirk Lyons was not what he seemed to be. And those with such suspicions included some very well known names in the nationalist movement—respected names—whose doubts about Lyons were just as solid as my own. And their doubts were based on very real (and very negative) experiences—not just gut instincts.

And then in 1995 the Oklahoma City bombing exploded with a vengeance. And there—lo and behold—was Kirk Lyons himself, having been in longtime collaboration with the mysterious German immigrant, Andreas Strassmeir whom, it is now generally conceded—at least by those informed folks who don't buy the official U.S. government version of events—was some sort of intelligence operative who had infiltrated the white nationalist movement in America and played some role—still unknown—in the circumstances surrounding the bombing.

And it should be noted that even the late highly regarded writer Sam Francis—an iconic figure among white separatists—was among those who had concluded that Strassmeir was indeed just that, as Francis mentioned (to the surprise of many) in one of his memorable syndicated columns, this one dated May 12, 1997.

Not only Lyons' client, he was also a close friend of Lyons who had played a part in bringing him to the United States in the first place. Known to speak Hebrew and having trained in Germany with Israeli military forces, from which he acquired an Israeli girlfriend, Strassmeir was not your prototypical "white separatist extremist," to say the least.

I later found out, from my longtime friend, Van Loman—a prominent and respected figure in the nationalist movement—that, on one occasion, Lyons had attempted to lure Loman into the intrigue surrounding Strassmeir. Loman, I suppose, can be thankful, under the circumstances, he did not end up being “linked” to the Oklahoma City bombing.

In any case, all of the tangled circumstances regarding the Strassmeir-Lyons affair are related in detail in *The Judas Goats*, but suffice it to say—to my satisfaction and to that of others who may have initially questioned my suspicions of Lyons—the die was cast.

It was all too patently clear that there was much more to Kirk Lyons than many of his longtime friends and associates wanted to admit—especially in light of the fact that he had operated closely within their ranks, gleaned many personal details and perhaps even some sensitive legal secrets confided to him as their attorney.

Finally—and most telling, from my perspective—at the time the details surrounding Lyons’ links to Strassmeir were coming to the fore, Lyons popped up as an open player in the destruction of the independent Populist Party which (as noted earlier) Liberty Lobby had played an instrumental part in creating. Lyons revealed his open hostility to Liberty Lobby when he represented a party official, Donald Wassall, in a legal matter that required me to serve as a witness in federal court and be questioned under oath by Lyons.

It was then that something happened—quite unexpectedly—which confirmed in my mind, if I had never completely believed it before—that Lyons was precisely what I had long suspected.

At one point during the trial, when Lyons asked me a question regarding some material that had appeared in *The Spotlight*, I responded, “My source on that, Mr. Lyons, was *your* FBI.”

The emphasis was on the word “your.”

My intent was to publicly, if rather subtly, suggest to Lyons—as I had already charged openly in *The Spotlight*—that Lyons was an FBI collaborator based on his association with Strassmeir who was (as we now know, based on multiple subsequent revelations) indeed an undercover informant (probably working with the infamous Southern Poverty Law Center and certainly with Lyons’ legal guidance as his attorney).

Although my remark went over the heads of the jury and probably most others in the courtroom, including federal Judge Lancaster himself, Lyons literally jumped back a foot or two, shrieking, “Objection.”

Lyons’ eyes were blazing. I realized at that moment that I was *absolutely on target* and Lyons was thoroughly astounded, horrified, angry that I had dared to make that accusation to his face, probably the first time it had ever been done.

At that moment, the opposing attorney jumped in, addressing the judge, saying, more or less, “Your honor, there’s nothing wrong with what Mr. Piper said. It’s Mr. Lyons’ FBI. It’s *your* FBI. It’s *everybody’s* FBI. We see no reason for Mr. Lyons to object.”

Lyons sputtered again, fuming, and Judge Lancaster slapped him down, saying, “Mr. Lyons, step back.” Lyons obediently did so. Then Lancaster ordered Lyons to “have a drink of water.” Dutifully, almost sheepishly, Lyons did have a drink of water. Then the judge instructed Lyons he could continue.

Having seen Lyons’ response—up close and personal—I now had no doubt Lyons was indeed a Judas Goat. Although he postured as a “white separatist attorney,” he and his associate, Dave Holloway, a former CIA pilot, (and their friend Strassmeir) were deep in the world of intrigue, betraying many good people who believed in them.

It is my personal speculation that Lyons—for whatever reasons—had been co-opted by the federal government at some time in his career and allowed to express what may (or may not) have been his personal views on racial matters—perhaps akin to the manner in which the FBI permitted its informant, the aforementioned KKK leader, Bill Wilkinson, to vent against Blacks (but not against Jews)—even as he (Lyons) was acting as an intelligence asset inside the white separatist movement.

Although, theoretically (and legally) nothing that any of Lyons’ clients had ever said to him could be used against them in any potential criminal cases, due to the standard of attorney-client privilege, that did not exempt or deny Lyons the opportunity to forage for any details about his clients’ associates and their activities and to later provide such data to the ADL, the Southern Poverty Law Center or to any number of law enforcement agencies. And that is what I believe that Kirk Lyons was doing for many, many years. And I don’t think Lyons will dare to sue me for saying so, because he—if anybody—knows that I am *right on target*.

It is—I will admit—rather frightening to deal on such levels, but it is one of the costs of being someone who has been called an “anti-Semite” and subject to the price of being so labeled. Dealing with the realities of such intrigues has been part and parcel of my existence for 30 years.

And I am not the only person who has had to deal with such things. Over the years I have learned of many people who have had similar dealings—always it seems stemming from their sometimes inadvertent tangling with the issue of “anti-Semitism” and matters dealing with the U.S. “special relationship” with Israel.

One particular example is worth noting and it says so very much about what we have been discussing in these pages: Many years ago I received a letter from a retired longtime former tenured professor at a

respected institution of higher learning in North Carolina. The professor was moved to write after reading something I had written in *The Spotlight* about the activities of the ADL. What the professor told me says much about the criminal nature of this putrid organization.

In the late 1950s the professor had traveled to the Holy Land and when he returned a local civic organization invited him to give a report of his visit to the land of Jesus. So the professor gave a talk about his experiences and in the course of so doing he happened to mention the distress on the part of Christian Arabs in the Holy Land about the fact that Israeli authorities were responsible for destroying ancient Christian sites. It was only a passing comment in a lengthy exposition that was really nothing more than a tourist's description of a trip to another land.

However, not long afterward, the professor learned that the ADL was energetically working behind the scenes to have him dismissed as a professor at the university. And this is an important point to be noted: bear in mind that the professor was not a teacher of theology or history or political science; rather, he was a professor in a scientific field and had no occasion at any time to discuss political topics in the classroom. And, in fact, until that time the professor had never entertained any serious political views one way or the other. He was a man of science.

But his experience with the criminal Jews at the ADL awakened him instantly to an ugly reality of which he never before known. It was then and there the professor "got political." If that story does not illustrate the criminal venality of organized Jewry in America, then nothing else will.

Although the ADL failed to destroy the professor, it did give a thoroughly well-educated man—a Ph.D. no less—a new realm of learning about a subject about which he previously knew nothing.

To this day I get boiling mad when I recount this story and to be perfectly honest, I really have to say that I would have to smile brightly if I learned that something terrible had happened to somebody associated with the ADL. That's just the kind of organization that it is. And, unfortunately, there are a lot of people in this country who bankroll the ADL. They, too, are criminals who don't deserve the right to live in America, because *what they support is thoroughly un-American*.

Now all of this—regarding the intrigues of the ~~the~~ Jewish power bloc in America—is very "political" in the truest sense of the word. But the fact of the matter is that, on a more mundane level, the issue of "anti-Semitism" is ever present. The issue just won't go away.

On that note, at this juncture, I am compelled—as we begin to close this volume—to reflect once again on some of my own interesting (I think) personal experiences that say much about "anti-Semitism" and how it impacts upon good (and often naive) people in our world today.

CHAPTER THIRTY

Good People—Everyday Folks— and the Problem of Anti-Semitism

Even as a high school student, as you may have gleaned from my earlier ruminations, I had a reputation for being quite a "radical" and, if truth be told, I was suspected (and rightly so) of having negative attitudes toward the front-line Jewish role in American political affairs.

Now, of course, most of my friends were largely a-political but they "knew" instinctively that it was "not nice" to be critical of Israel and the Jews. Obviously, that was something they "learned" from the so-called "educational" process and from the mass media, even though they, themselves, didn't have any real opinions on the matter one way or the other.

I recall one very nice little red-haired girl, who overheard me condemning Jewish intrigues in Palestine, coming up to me and saying, "Why don't you like Jewish people? They're just like everybody else. They just have a different religion." She meant well, of course, and to this day I wonder if she ever discovered that there was much more to the story. Note that she equated criticism of Israel with "not liking Jewish people."

The very irony is that she (at that point) had probably never even met or known any Jews and, I suspect, she maybe never has!

Contrast that with the fact that, in my long and sordid career, I've had multiple Jewish friends—even including some all-out supporters of Israel—and dealt regularly on a daily basis with many Jewish folks about whose political agendas I have been totally unaware, but whose acquaintance I've enjoyed immensely. But I understood that girl's ignorance then and I still do to this day.

In the rural community where I was raised, there were few people who even had any idea of what was going on in Palestine. Those who even knew there was a place called Israel were largely Christian fundamentalists of the dispensationalist stripe. The average, down-to-earth, hard-working folks didn't have time to worry about U.S. policy toward Israel and the Arab world.

If truth be told, most people I grew up among probably didn't even know there were such things as "Arabs" and to the extent that they did know there were Arabs, they probably thought that the word "Arab" was a synonym for the word "hijacker." (And that was a long time before 9-11!)

However, I do recall hearing of a rivalry between two local businessmen—self-made millionaires—one of whom, C. D. "Catty" Zimmerman (of Germanic stock), was reputed to have bragged that he had outdone his rival by having been the first one (of the two) to have walked in the same Red Sea that Jesus parted!

So I suppose it could be said that there was at least one person in those central Pennsylvania mountains who did have at least some idea of the existence of that strip of land on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean that was then—as now—so central to the controversies of our time.

However, I do have a certain satisfaction in knowing that there was one particularly popular and respected individual in our little community who shared my concerns about the malign nature of the Jewish occupation of Palestine and the Jewish treatment (that is, mis-treatment) of the Christian and Muslim natives of that land.

My late friend Lucy Buck Lehman—along with her husband, Ken—was very much a critic of the Israeli hard-liners and quite sympathetic to the Palestinian freedom movement.

Believe me when I tell you that there were (and are still) many people who are shocked—and I do mean “shocked”—to learn that Ken and Lucy shared the opinions of “that radical Mike Piper” on this particular issue. Ken and Lucy were intellectuals in the best sense, well-read, widely-traveled (all over the planet) and were down-to-earth “good” people, full of energy and humor. Real gems.

Lucy was a high school teacher and a no-holds-barred piss-and-vinegar advocate of unfettered free speech and, quite appropriately, she was my “speech” teacher during my senior year in high school. She encouraged me to “speak out” and noted, once, that “a lot of people don’t understand you.” (Oh, how true that was!)

Ironically, I never even spoke to Lucy until I had her as a teacher in my senior year (although I knew most of the other teachers reasonably well) but she and I “attached” immediately. She admired, so she said, my “gusto,” and I was flattered when she wrote in a personal note to me at the end of my senior year, “Mr. Michael Collins Piper, I am sorry that I haven’t known you sooner,” adding, on a political note, “Humanity *will* survive with thinking people fanning the flames.”

I shared the sentiments. But over the years, I kept in touch with this great lady and her husband who—very much a partner with his wife in the greatest sense—also became a friend to many of Lucy’s students, even many years after those students had graduated and moved onward and outward from the hills of central Pennsylvania.

Lucy once insisted to me that “There was a Holocaust. I know it for a fact. I saw it first-hand,” she noted, pointing out that she had been a nurse in the Red Cross in Europe during World War II and had even served at Dachau concentration camp after the end of the war.

But I have to tell you, to be honest, that—with great relish—I pointed out to Lucy that no less than Simon Wiesenthal, the famed Nazi hunter,

and other Jewish sources, for that matter, had finally admitted that there were none of the famous “gassings” at Dachau. She understood the point, but her emotional commitment to “The Holocaust” remained.

However, despite Lucy’s dedication to the legend of “The Holocaust,” that didn’t stop her from being a critic of Israel and that alone demonstrates what an intellectually honest and genuine humanitarian she was. Lucy and her husband understood that what was happening to the Palestinians was precisely what the Jews loudly proclaimed was what had happened to them during World War II.

It’s probably worth noting that Lucy once told me this: “I have something in my safe deposit box that you would absolutely love to have. It’s a first edition of the works of Lord Byron, printed in Germany in English in the 1820s. It was in the private library of Adolf Hitler in his mountain retreat at Berchtesgaden.”

How she obtained this prize is an interesting story. During her Red Cross service in post-war Germany she made the acquaintance of an American army officer who had been part of the 101st Airborne Division that was the first American military group that had arrived at the famous “Berghof” at the end of the war. The young man complained that he had arrived “too late” and those who had come before him had made off with “the good stuff” like daggers and other souvenirs. “All I got was this,” he said, with some notable disappointment, showing Lucy the book. “Do you want it?” he asked. And needless to say, Lucy took the prize for herself.

After Lucy died—too soon—that book from Hitler’s library went up for auction. I just happened to see the auction notice in my hometown newspaper and I rushed up to Pennsylvania with the avowed intention of making that book mine.

There were lots of other items to be sold, but then the moment came. The auctioneer began, “Do I hear \$5? Mike Piper, I know you’re here.” There were two people who started the bidding—and both of them, by the way, happened to be Jewish antique dealers. The bidding never got any higher than about \$50. I shouted out, “Five hundred dollars!”—a full week’s pay—and the auction came to an abrupt end.

Moments after I assumed ownership of the book, one of the Jewish gentlemen nervously made his way over to me and said, with a strange look in his eyes, “Can I ask you something? Why did you buy that?” I happened to be standing with an old friend of mine, whom I hadn’t seen in years until that day, and she responded to him with a smile, “Oh, it’s a long story.” I nodded my head and said, quite simply, “Yeah.”

And it has been a long story, needless to say.

Another personal story is probably worth noting in the context of all of this. At the time when a good friend of mine from high school days

graduated from college, his parents hosted a dinner party for him and among the invitees was the charming and quite beautiful Jewish girlfriend of his younger brother. Several of my friends hastened to tell me that I shouldn't "talk about the Jews" in her presence, as though they feared that I might step up on my portable soap-box, which I carry with me to all public events, and begin lecturing about "The Jewish Problem."

As it so happened, the young lady and I ended up sitting together at one of the banquet tables and, much to my surprise (and hers), one of those who had warned me not to defame God's Chosen People proclaimed, quite passionately, and very much out of the blue: "Piper doesn't believe the Holocaust happened." A few others—whom I knew didn't care less about the matter, one way or the other—chimed in, expressing their equal dismay at the thought that someone could think this way.

I muttered, "Well, that's not exactly what I believe," but the Jewish girl said simply and firmly, "Well, I believe the Holocaust happened, but here in America we have freedom of speech and people are allowed to believe what ever they want to believe." She wanted to end the discussion.

However, my Holocaust-infatuated friend didn't let up. He wanted to pursue the matter with a vengeance. It was not that he was really that interested in the Holocaust or even particularly concerned about what I believed. He just "knew" it was politically correct to denounce me for not believing what he had been "educated" to believe was something that people just simply "had" to believe. He went on to pronounce his personal horror, his absolute outrage, I could believe such a terrible thing.

But the Jewish girl wouldn't play the game and said, "Well, let's talk about something else." And the Holocaust Enthusiast finally got the message and shut up, a bit red in the face. (A nice fellow, actually.)

Later, in a private moment, I said to the Jewish girl, with a laugh, "I won't apologize for his comments, since it's not my place to apologize," and she said, laughing, "That's right." I said, "They just can't get over the fact that there's an anti-Semite and a Jew in this room together."

She laughed and nodded her head, saying, "The fact that he even brought it up tells me what *he* is thinking about, not what *you're* thinking about." And as it was, I actually spent more time socializing with the young lady during the balance of the evening than the rest of the nice Gentiles—good Christians all—who were there!

All of that said, it's appropriate—in light of the public (and private) devotion (on the part of many people) to loudly and proudly fighting "anti-Semitism" and calling it out whenever they see (or perceive) it—to reflect on the words of Adam Garfinkle, writing in his lively and quite sensible book (mentioned previously) *Jewcentricity: Why the Jews Are Praised, Blamed, and Used to Explain Just About Everything*:

Everyone, Jews and non-Jews alike, could profit from a little more non-attention to the wrong things. Non-Jews should pay less attention to the Jews and the Jews should pay more attention to themselves—meaning to the state of their spiritual and communal life.

Too many Jews spend way too much time worrying about and exaggerating the implications of what others think of them. By exaggerating what others think, they ascribe to it and thus create for it far more influence than would otherwise be the case. If Jews would be a little less Jewcentric themselves, especially in public, there is just a chance, if only a small one, that non-Jews will become less Jewcentric too.

What Garfinkle says makes much sense. And it underscores, really, something that I have said, time and again. While many of my critics have accused me of talking and writing too much about the Jews and their influence in America, it has always been my contention that my own rhetorical stance has been, in fact, a reaction to the fact that the Jews themselves have always been insistent about talking about themselves and their special interests, placing Jewish concerns—through the aegis of the mass media—into the center of popular debate in America (and around the globe) today.

Garfinkle also says that "Perhaps we learn from history, too, that it is, paradoxically, the enemies of the Jews who end up saving the Jews." And, that respect, I really do believe that when I have dared to discuss these matters, I have actually lent a friendly hand to the Jews, perhaps helping them realize, in some way, that they have just simply pushed matters a little too far for their own good, particularly in the realm of U.S. policy toward Israel and the Arab and Muslim worlds.

And there is no question that the matter of Israel—vis-a-vis American interests—is an ever-present problem that is not about to go away any time soon, especially because of the Jewish determination that the United States devote itself exclusively to Israel's interests, no matter what impact it may have on the survival of America itself. And this is a point that will become even more profound as time passes.

Jewish power in America—so predominant—will remain a critical issue (a pivotal problem) until it is finally resolved.

Let us all pray that it is resolved peacefully.

**The Jewish Century:
Jewish Power in America—
Where Does It Go From Here?**

Earlier we reflected upon the panderings of American "Goy" George Gilder whose philo-Semitic writings do reach into the realm of philo-Semitic obsession. A conversely contrary writer would be accused of anti-Semitic "madness." Gilder has gone so far, even, to assert—as if to say it makes it true—the following:

Virtually all Americans who have achieved anything important in the 20th Century have had crucial Jewish colleagues and collaborators. Virtually none of the significant scientific and technological feats of the 20th Century would have been possible without critical contributions by Jews.

And in a revealing flourish, Gilder also claims that "Even some of the best Christian preachers and theologians turn out to be Jewish." It is as if Gilder is suggesting that non-Jews cannot succeed—even in their own religious realm—without Jewish input. Or in any other endeavor.

Gilder also asserts that it is "rarely acknowledged openly or explored for its consequences" that "in any rivalry with intellectual dimensions, disproportionate numbers of the challengers and of the winners will be Jewish." But Gilder does not mention the fact that Jewish influence in both the mass media and in academia—bankrolled by immense Jewish fortunes based on American shores and around the globe—contributes to the fact that "the winners" end up being Jewish.

However, while we can (perhaps) forgive Gilder for his pandering and his claims about what he calls "the superior performance" of the Jews in so many aspects of global affairs, we must recognize that his attitude (reflecting Zionist ideology) constitutes a war-mongering perspective that could inflame the already-heated tinderbox of the Middle East.

Charging that the Palestine Liberation Organization "has always essentially been a Nazi organization," Gilder suggests that even when American "experts" have urged the creation of a Palestinian state that "they were effectively endorsing a Nazi national movement with roots in Europe." Gilder also says—and these are his inflammatory words:

The Palestinian Arab leaders have shown themselves to be mostly Nazis. Anyone who believes these men should command a nation-state next to Israel is delusional.

There is only one answer to the claims and demands and threats of such people and that is "no."

The leaders of Iran are [also] proud Nazis.

Anyone who believes that the West can stand aside and conduct negotiations while they acquire access is a gull who has failed to learn anything from the history of the 20th Century.

The President of Syria is equally obsessed with Jews and Israel. The Wahhabis of Saudi Arabia in their madrassas around the globe are cultivating new armies of young Brownshirts.

The civilized world must show enough courage of its convictions to answer all of the neo-Nazis with a resounding "no."

The intent, the essence, the foundation—the very meaning of all of what Gilder suggests—is so contrary to what the civilized world believes that Gilder can only be counted—along with those who think as he does, and the includes, I'm sorry to say, most Jews—as a voice of evil, the personification of a substantive, existential danger to the the world as we know it today.

Should Gilder's point of view be unchallenged and prevail in America beyond question we should not be surprised when, one day in the future, the United States finds itself embroiled in a global conflict into which we have been drawn precisely because of America's intimate entanglement with Jewish power politics.

Unless the likes of Gilder—and those to whom he panders—are removed from the centers of power in America, we can be certain that America's days are numbered.

Unfortunately, the preponderance of the evidence before us suggests that Jewish power has risen to heights we might never have imagined possible. And there is not yet any indication that it has reached its zenith.

Although a Jewish writer in Russia, Yuri Sletzkind, wrote a book entitled *The Jewish Century*, describing—in all candor—the rise of Jewish power in Russia during the bloody days of Jewish Bolshevism, it is not inaccurate to say (with some regret) that the 20th Century in America was indeed "The Jewish Century."

The question that thus arises is whether we will see, in the 21st Century, an American popular uprising against Jewish power, ultimately bringing it to heel.

Although we could spend endless pages outlining the massive corruption of the American system by Jewish money, particularly in the realm of mis-directing U.S. foreign policy, one particular instance—involving two major American political figures—is well worth noting in these pages. This example (which follows) in many respects says it all:

We refer to the dirtied-up duo of former "Dubya" Bush administration Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and former Vice President Dan Quayle, who served one undistinguished term in that office before the ouster of his senior partner, George H. W. Bush, as president in 1996.

If anyone ever had any question as to why Rumsfeld was a major figure inside the Bush administration advancing the interests of the war-mongering pro-Israel neo-conservative network, pushing the United States into the Hellish and foolish, unnecessary, no-win war in Iraq—yet another Jewish War of Survival—the answer is actually quite simple. It's actually been quite profitable for the former defense secretary.

Rumsfeld—along with Quayle—maintained intimate and lucrative ties to Cerberus Global Investments, a New York-based holding company which, in 2008, purchased the Israeli government's interest in Bank Leumi, the second largest bank in Israel.

The revelation came in the Nov. 15, 2008 issue of the Israeli newspaper, *Ha'aretz*, which reported that, at least as far back as 2001, Rumsfeld was an investor in the company, citing a report that appeared in the Oct. 3, 2005 issue of *Business Week*, based on financial disclosure forms that Rumsfeld was required to file under federal ethics laws.

Business Week report went so far as to describe Cerberus as being "bigger" than even such well-known business giants as McDonald's, 3M, Coca-Cola and Cisco Systems, pointing out that Cerberus controls some 226 Burger King restaurants, the National and Alamo car-rental chains, building products maker Formica Corp., and the old Warner Hollywood Studios. Cerberus, clearly, is a force to be reckoned with.

What is of particular interest regarding Rumsfeld's Cerberus investments (vis-a-vis his insistent demand that the United States invade Iraq and occupy the country, as it does today) is that *Business Week* asserted that Cerberus has also "set up military base camps in Iraq."

As far as former Vice President Quayle is concerned, this giant brain is now ensconced as the "front man" at Cerberus (serving as chairman of the board). However, the real power at the big consortium is the 45-year-old chief executive officer, Stephen Feinberg, described by *Ha'aretz* as "a New York Jew with a golden touch"—a "shy wunderkind" who "makes himself scarce around photographers and sends underlings like Cerberus chair Dan Quayle to sign his deals."

So although Quayle's liberal Democratic critics often made fun of the former vice president, questioning his capacities, it's pretty clear that Quayle, after leaving the second highest office in the land, had finally found his niche as a well-paid "shabbas goy" for his elite Jewish masters.

While current U.S. ethics laws do not prohibit past or present U.S. federal official—such as the defense secretary or the ex-vice president—

from having financial interests in companies that are owned by foreign interests or otherwise benefit foreign governments, there are those who might find a conflict of interest, particularly in the case of Rumsfeld.

After all, critics note, *Ha'aretz* reported that the Israeli government's finance ministry said that the proceeds of the Cerberus purchase of a controlling interest in Bank Leumi would go toward "paying off Israel's high national debt."

This is particularly ironic, of course, because of Rumsfeld's key role in helping orchestrate the war against Iraq—a major aim of the Israeli lobby and its foreign principal, the state of Israel.

The U.S. engagement against Iraq did so much to increase America's national debt, a debt that keeps on growing, even as Rumsfeld's friends at Cerberus are directly involved in perpetuating the U.S. military presence in the beleaguered Arab republic.

Iraq is now a shattered shell of what it once was: a nation which—prior to the first U.S. offensive against Iraq in 1991—was on the verge of being formally recognized as a "First World" country.

So here, again, we have two particularly influential American political figures literally in the pocket of wealthy international Jewish money interests, carrying out and/or promoting policies that have been contrary to the interests of America and the world itself.

How much more corruption of the American system by the Jewish money interests are Americans expected to tolerate?

In truth, things have actually gotten much worse.

Earlier, we reviewed the phony "campaign reform" measure railroaded into law by Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.)—legislation that actually enhanced the power of Jewish organizations.

But in the run-up to the 2010 congressional elections—which saw the Republican Party seize control of the House of Representatives—a particularly noxious Supreme Court ruling gave free rein (even more so) to big money interests. The court struck down long-standing legislation that prohibited corporations from making donations to political organizations that, in turn, make so-called "independent expenditures" on behalf of favored federal candidates.

As a consequence of the ruling, tens of millions of dollars were plowed into the 2010 elections by Jewish big money interests (and others) who influenced the political system by funding the groups making the independent expenditures on behalf of favored candidates. And what is so outrageous is that, under the law, the groups making the expenditures are not required to report the names of their donors!

In the 2010 elections, these corporate contributions played a singular role in the GOP takeover of the House of Representatives and it is no

coincidence that many of these donors have been linked in various reports to the infamous Wall Street "hedge fund" racket that—let it be said in all candor—has always had an inordinately "Jewish tinge."

And this is no small point considering the fact that the GOP's victory ushered in a consolidation of pro-Israeli political influence over Congress unlike ever before.

Exemplifying these new developments (both in terms of the new rise of secret big money contributions and the further advancement of Jewish power) was the rapid-fire rise of Rep. Eric Cantor (R-Va.), a deeply religious Orthodox Jew and pro-Israeli "neo-conservative" hard-liner who was named House majority leader in the new GOP-controlled Congress.

Although the majority leader post is officially the No. 2 slot in the House of Representatives, Cantor has been exercising tremendous behind-the-scenes power in the Republican caucus—greater, in some respects, than even Rep. John Boehner (R-Ohio), who became speaker of the House (and with whom Cantor has never been on the best of terms).

Cantor's particular influence stems from his control—along with another pro-Israeli hardliner, former Sen. Norm Coleman (R-Minn.)—of a secretive and well-funded political action committee, the American Action Network (AAN), run by Cantor's close advisor and former chief of staff, Rob Collins.

Cantor's AAN operation is believed to have raised up to \$25 million in 2010 and spent at least \$16 million in waging expenditures on behalf of Cantor-approved (i.e. Jewish-approved) GOP candidates.

On Oct. 25, 2010 even *The Washington Post* described AAN as "mysterious" and described Collins as one of "a small circle of operatives with the coveted expertise of actually running such secretive organizations." Collins himself has said, "I have a weird gift for raising money."

And that gift bestowed (presumably by God) upon Cantor's henchman gave increased power to Cantor, who played a major part though AAN in orchestrating the GOP victory, bankrolled by well-heeled contributors whose names, as we've said, are not required to be revealed to the Federal Election Commission.

It is no coincidence that two other, similar fundraising ventures, American Crossroads and Crossroads GPS—both run by former George W. Bush operative Karl Rove—share offices with Cantor's AAN.

Ellen Miller of the Sunlight Foundation said the massive spending by such groups in the 2010 elections is the "how-to" for the 2012 election. "It's how to use corporate money, how to use secret money, to buy elections," she said. "It's going to be no holds barred."

And as far as Cantor is concerned, individually, while most members of Congress generally rely on campaign contributions from within their

own districts, examination of Cantor's reported contributions indicate that his political fortunes have relied extensively on a great deal of money supplied by Jewish contributors from across the country.

Cantor is able to tap into those same sources to fund his AAN operation on behalf of pro-Israel Republicans. So Cantor's access to tens of millions of dollars in secret cash contributions makes this young Jewish congressman particularly influential, today and in the future.

The influx of so many new GOP "conservatives" elected with Cantor's help will also expand the influence of the Republican Study Committee—of which Cantor is a member—which is composed of more than a hundred GOP congressmen, all of whom are vociferous allies of the Jewish lobby.

The RSC's executive director, Paul Teller—who described himself to *The Washington Post* as the RSC's "token Jew"—formerly served on the staff of Rep. Mike Pence (R-Ind.).

Pence once described how every time the subject of Israel was mentioned on the House floor, he (Pence) rushed there to hear what was being said. Pence (a grown man) *actually* said that. And it demonstrates how politicians today demonstrate no shame in expressing their genuinely weird—there's no other way to describe it—fealty to Israel.

The Republican victory also brought control of at least two key House committees into the hands of pro-Israel lawmakers.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee's new chair is Cuban-born Ileana Ros-Lehtinen. She has long been one of the loudest advocates for Israel in Washington. Upon her election to Congress in 1988 and for years afterward, she was touted as "the first woman of Hispanic origin elected to the House," but then the truth came out: Ros-Lehtinen was the granddaughter of Sephardic Jews from Turkey who migrated to Cuba.

The new chair of the Homeland Security Committee is Rep. Peter King (R-N.Y.) who—although an Irish Catholic who attended the University of Notre Dame—is a boisterous and strident voice for Israeli interests and he launched his new stewardship of the committee by launching a proverbial "witch hunt" against Muslims in America in the guise of "fighting terrorism."

Abroad, the consequences of the GOP victory were noted in the context of Israel's concerns. In Israel, Danny Danon, a hardliner in Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's Likud Party, expressed delight:

The huge influx of newly elected representatives and senators to Washington includes dozens of strong friends of Israel who will put the brakes on the consistently dubious, sometimes dangerous policies of President Obama these past two years.

Meanwhile, Saudi Arabia's former ambassador to the United States, Prince Turki al-Faisal—who was the incoming Saudi foreign minister—warned in a speech in Washington following the Great Republican Victory that he foresaw a return of the "neo-conservative philosophy" and that the election results would "give more fodder for these warmongers to pursue their favorite exercise, war-making."

The Arab diplomat bluntly declared that "neo-con advisors, American conservatives and Zionist extremists" have promoted policies that "continually throw a wrench into the progress of peace." He added that:

Particularly in the Congress, the bipartisan support for Israel has been enormous; it's not just Republicans. My concern is really with the people who speak up for a more aggressive type of policy, as espoused by neo-conservatives. They will interpret these elections as, if you like, a return to what they would consider to be their view on foreign policy in general and . . . particularly on the Middle East.

In fact—and it is no coincidence—a review of the aforementioned Eric Cantor's own campaign financing demonstrates that Jewish billionaires in the global financial plutocracy—all intimately tied to the London-based Rothschild family—have been underwriting Cantor's career, a point (especially in light of his immense power) that cannot be taken lightly.

The truth is that Cantor is one of the very few members of Congress who has some of the richest and most powerful people in the world bankrolling his political endeavors. It is for very good reason that wags say Cantor is now "the Cantor of the House"—a play on Cantor's Jewish family name. A "cantor" is the individual in a synagogue who leads the chants and prayers along with the rabbi—a major religious role.

As noted earlier, the young congressman is unique among House members: While most members rely on campaign contributions mainly from their own congressional districts, Cantor has an unusually expansive array of contributions pouring in from across the country.

One of Cantor's election filings—recorded at campaignmoney.com—shows he received 146 contributions from New York donors. Contrast that to only 36 donations from New York that went to Cantor's ostensible senior partner in the Republican takeover of the House, Boehner, who had been a top-ranking GOP figure for more than a few years. Yet, even Boehner could not rival Cantor in the number of out-of-state cash contributions.

A brief sampling of Cantor's New York State contributors alone demonstrates the real clout of the big Jewish names who are bankrolling this influential Jewish power broker:

- Kenneth Bialkin, a Jewish crime syndicate legal mouthpiece, former national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, former chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, and now chairman of the America-Israel Friendship League, and also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the New York-based offshoot of the London-based Royal Institute for International Affairs, the Rothschild empire's foreign policy arm;

- Gary Cohn, president and chief operating officer of Goldman Sachs, the infamous Wall Street investment bank whose financial schemes are well known to many Americans who've seen their pensions plundered;

- Steven Drucker of Charmer Sunbelt, a massive liquor conglomerate that has grabbed control of various facets of the U.S. spirits industry;

- Lewis M. Eisenberg who, as a former Goldman Sachs partner, is perhaps best known for serving as chairman from 1995 to the pivotal year of 2001 of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey—at which time the authority turned World Trade Center (WTC) ownership over to international wheeler-dealer, Larry Silverstein, who had the WTC twin towers well insured and conveniently made billions from the 9-11 attacks.

- Henry Kravis, a member of both the CFR and Rothschild-controlled Bilderberg group, who was one of the famous "junk bond kings" of the 1980s through his Kohlberg-Kravis-Roberts partnership;

- Ronald Perelman, billionaire head of the Revlon cosmetics empire. He also heads a far-reaching network of radio and television stations. At one point he was said to have been the richest man in America; and

- James Tisch, another CFR member and a scion of the billionaire Tisch family who bought control of CBS in the 1980s.

These are just a few of the powerful New Yorkers who've been channeling funds to Cantor's political enterprises. Three of Cantor's other notable national contributors are:

- Jeffrey Epstein of California, chief financial officer and executive vice president of the Oracle Corporation, the fiefdom of Larry Ellison, who rose to fame in the 1970s working on a database for the CIA (named "Oracle"). After 9-11, Ellison offered to donate software to the U.S. government to help set up a national identification database, from which national ID cards for American citizens would be issued;

- Neil Livingstone of Washington, D.C., a shadowy figure from the world of intelligence, known for longtime close ties to Israel's Mossad; and

- Sheldon Adelson, the Las Vegas-based casino tycoon—the self-described "richest Jew in the world"—who, in many respects, is the modern-day incarnation of the late Meyer Lansky, longtime chief of the Jewish crime syndicate which cemented its influence with the rise of legalized casino gambling in Las Vegas.

In short, the Washington political arena—as it has never been before—is now a Jewish fiefdom and the rise of Eric Cantor makes it ever more so. And Americans who might dare to question this inordinate Jewish power will, of course, be called . . . “anti-Semites.”

In light of this Jewish monopoly—or something that comes very close to being a monopoly—on the American political system, it is probably appropriate to close with consideration of a remarkably prescient 1909 series of drawings by an un-named English artist.

According to Jeffrey Herf, writing in *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust* (referenced earlier in these pages), the series of drawings (later republished by the German public information agency) portray these images:

An Uncle Sam figure comes up behind a Native American standing at the edge of a cliff. Uncle Sam then pushes the Indian off the cliff. A caricatured Jewish figure emerges from his hiding place behind a rock, pushes Uncle Sam over the cliff, and stands triumphant at the cliff's edge. The United States, having pushed aside the original inhabitants, has now been over-run . . . by a wave of Jewish immigrants, who [displaced] traditional America.

Herf notes that the poster reproducing the images quoted Heinrich Graetz, a 19th Century historian of the Jews, to the effect that the Jews will flourish “in the land of freedom and equality” and that “a large powerful Jewry will emerge in the 20th Century.” The poster asserted:

This is exactly what has happened. The Jews have reached their goal in the United States. Jews and comrades of the Jews are the real rulers in the USA. They pushed the American people into the war in order to extend their power over Europe and the rest of the world. . . . We will not lay down our arms until Jewry and its accomplices are defeated and its influences finally destroyed. The rule of Jewry will be brought to an end.

While the prediction that Germany would bring the rule of Jewry to an end has certainly not come true, it is abundantly clear that those illustrations do represent the reality of affairs in the United States today.

And the truth is that there are growing numbers of people around the globe who have come to understand the nature of the problem. In the next chapter we will consider the manner in which Zionism and Jewish power is now being confronted in Russia—the one global powerhouse that could play a definitive role in resolving the damnable, ever-present Problem of anti-Semitism at last.

CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

Will the New Titus Arise from Russia? A New Paradigm for the 21st Century

In my own extensive travels I have heard many good people from all walks of life and from all cultures openly expressing concerns about the age-old Jewish Problem as it impacts upon our world today. And unlike in America, people are not afraid to speak out.

Note, for example, that in modern-day Russia—long the testing ground for the Jewish philosophy known as “communism”—there is an open and fervent opposition to Jewish power being heard even from the ranks of the Communist Party itself.

Over a 15 year period (from 1969 to 1985) there were some 230 books published in the Soviet Union—selling more than 9 million copies—that exposed Zionism and Freemasonry, this during a time frame when the American Jewish lobby and their fellow-traveling Trotskyites and their “conservative” allies were loudly proclaiming that there was no freedom of expression in the Soviet Union. In fact, so it seems, our Jewish friends were actually more concerned about the fact that there was *too much* freedom of expression (at least in *some* respects) in Russia.

To the surprise of many in the West—particularly old-fashioned anti-communist (and often traditionally anti-Jewish) Cold Warriors, who are unaware of the immense political changes that have come forth in the old Soviet Union—the Communist Party in Russia has now become a stronghold of anti-Jewish opinion. This is the new paradigm.

Considering the nature of what the Russian people suffered, first under Jewish Bolshevism and then later, under the so-called “reform” regime of Boris Yeltsin that advanced the goals of Jewish Capitalism, it is probably no surprise that the Russian people and their leaders are very much aware of the problems surrounding anti-Semitism and are now reacting openly and aggressively in bringing the issue to the fore.

As far back as 1998, General Albert Makashov, a Communist Party leader in the Russian parliament, accused the Jews of ruining the Russian economy: “Who is to blame? The executive branch, the bankers, the mass media, they are to blame. Usury, deceit, corruption, and thievery are flourishing in the country. That is why I call the reformers ‘Yids,’ he said.

Later in an editorial in *Zavtra*, Makashov said a “yid” was “a blood-sucker feeding on the misfortunes of other people. They drink the blood of the indigenous peoples of the state. They are destroying industry and agriculture.” Makashov subsequently announced that he would “round up all the Jews and send them to the next world.”

Not long afterward, Victor Ilyukhin, Communist chairman of the Russian Parliament's security committee, declared that the Jews in the

government of Boris Yeltsin were carrying out "a genocide against the Russian people."

Gennadi Zyuganov, head of the Communist Party, endorsed Ilyukhin's remarks and said Zionism was among the "most aggressive circles striving for world domination," and that "too many people with strange-sounding family names mingle in the internal affairs of Russia," a turn of phrase that, in many respects, reflects the state of affairs in even the United States today. Zyuganov then added:

Communists rightly ask how it can be that key positions in a number of economic sectors were seized by representatives of one ethnic group. They see how control over most of the electronic media—which are waging a destructive campaign against our Fatherland and its morality, language, culture and beliefs—is concentrated in the hands of those same individuals.

In truth, we know now, there had been an emerging anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist tilt at the highest ranks of the Soviet Union, even going back to the days of Josef Stalin himself, a point that many still fail to recognize today, caught up in the imagery and memory of the Cold War.

In 2006 Enigma Books published the rantings of Soviet-born Jewish Zionist Roman Brackman, a frantic stemwinder entitled *Israel at High Noon: From Stalin's Failed Satellite to the Challenge of Iran*. Brackman—sent to the Gulag in 1950, but freed in 1954, one year after the death of Stalin—later hotfooted it off to Poland and then to Israel and the United States where he is now ensconced.

Still smarting from Stalin's campaigns against Jewish power in Soviet Russia, Brackman describes how in 1948 Stalin hosted a dinner party at which Stalin proposed a toast to the memory of Lenin, calling him "our leader, our teacher, our all." But, according to Brackman, at least one of the attendees was forced to wonder whether Stalin was serious or joking; that is, Stalin himself was perceived to be mocking the iconic Lenin, the leader of the Jewish vanguard that seized power and set in place the vaunted Bolshevik Revolution.

Later, during that dinner, Stalin asked one of the guests, a member of the Yugoslavian politburo, Milovan Djilas, whether there were many Jews in that body, noting there were none in the Soviet politburo. In apparent sarcastic merriment, mocking Jewish howls about "anti-Semitism," Stalin then shouted at Djilas, "You're an anti-Semite, an anti-Semite!"

Then, as the guests were about to leave the dinner party, Stalin played what Brackman described as a "loud, cacophonous record of wolves yowling, barking and howling." Stalin kept laughing until he

noticed that Djilas was baffled. Stalin then said, "Well, still, it's clever, devilishly clever." According to Brackman, Djilas did not realize that "for Stalin, the wolves represented the Jews."

Although one of Stalin's wives was Jewish and he also certainly had many Jewish henchmen, the totality of the record demonstrates that—despite his tactical alliance with the United States and Britain (and the Jews) during World War II—Stalin had been engaged in a long-standing covert (and not-so-covert) war against Jewish forces within the Soviet Union and their allies abroad.

In this regard, in his 1993 book, *The Trotskys, Freuds, and Woody Allens: A Portrait of a Culture* (published by Viking Press), Ivan Kalmar, a professor of anthropology at the University of Toronto, noted that what he called "the first serious anti-Semitic campaign" within the Soviet Communist Party took place at the party's 14th Congress in 1927 over the issue of internationalism.

At that Congress it was Stalin who led the fight against internationalism—and against its foremost advocate Leon Trotsky. Kalmar described this as "Stalin's anti-Jewish counter-revolution" in favor of "socialism in one country." And in the wake of that counter-revolution, Trotsky was expelled from the Soviet Union and later killed, in exile, at Stalin's orders.

The aforementioned Roman Brackman pointed out something else rather interesting: that in 1939 shortly after Germany's Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Joachim von Ribbentrop, visited Moscow, Stalin told A. M. Kollontai, the Soviet ambassador to Sweden: "Zionism strives for world domination; it will take revenge for all of our successes and achievements . . . International Zionism, with all its power, will strive to destroy our union so that Russia would never recover."

Brackman pointed out that in the days before Stalin's death, Soviet party and government circles were openly discussing "the liberation of the Soviet Union from the Jewish yoke."

One old-line Bolshevik said there was talk of "the transportation of Jews to Birobidjan." Brackman asserts that when Stalin was told when it would be difficult to transport a large number of Jews there, Stalin responded, "Half of them will die on the way there." According to Brackman, Stalin's defense minister, Nikolai Boulganin, said Stalin intended to organize assaults on the trains transporting the Jews, such assaults to be conducted by "people's avengers."

Brackman notes, rather slyly, that Purim—the greatest of all Jewish celebrations of the destruction of their many foes—began at sundown on Saturday, February 28, 1953 and in fact, it was on the night of February 28, 1953 that Stalin went to sleep at his dacha and not long afterward it was discovered Stalin was in physical distress and died soon afterward.

In their 2003 book, *Stalin's Last Crime*, Jonathan Brent and Vladimir Naumov published evidence that Stalin was almost certainly murdered after he began moving toward exorcising Zionism from Soviet circles of power. Describing Stalin's drive against the Zionists, the authors wrote that if Stalin had not been removed from power, "much subsequent world history might have been quite different." They added:

Many leading Kremlin figures would have been purged and probably shot; the security services and the military would have been decimated by purges; Soviet intellectuals and artists, particularly Jews, would have been mercilessly suppressed; and the surviving remnant of Soviet and Eastern European Jewry would have been gravely (perhaps mortally) imperiled, while grievous suffering would have been inflicted on all the citizens of the Soviet Union. Another Great Terror, such as occurred in the late 1930s, was averted when Stalin suddenly died on March 5, 1953. Stalin's version of a "final solution" remained unfulfilled . . .

And although even today there are those—including many legitimate and traditional American anti-communists—who believe Stalin was actually in alliance with Jewish interests, as evidenced by his immediate recognition of the State of Israel, Brent and Naumov comment that in 1948, "The Jews and Israel were not yet the enemies of the Soviet state they soon became." So the point is this: a very real rift—one long in development—between Stalin and the Zionist (and Trotskyite) elements was very much a reality, popular legend notwithstanding.

In fact, by 1952, when Stalin was intensifying his campaign against Jewish elements, Brent and Naumov pointed out that the irony that many American Jewish spies for the Soviet Union would have found it hard to imagine they were working for "a country whose leaders soon thereafter would turn against the entire Jewish population of the Soviet Union and, at the highest governmental levels, was seriously considering the idea of the detention and deportation of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of innocent people."

In light of all of this, in the Jan/Feb 2003 issue of *The Barnes Review*—the Revisionist history journal published by Willis A. Carto—the Russian nationalist historian, Dr. Oleg Platonov, offered readers a fascinating history of Russia's historic troubles with both Jewish-Zionist and Jewish-Bolshevik agitation.

Platonov asserted, flat-out, that Stalin had indeed launched a major offensive against Zionism. The words of Platonov, a leading Russian intel-

lectual today, and who is in the forefront of the fight against Jewish influence in 21st Century Russia, are worth reviewing. Platonov wrote:

The Jewish-Bolshevik rule over Russia was broken by Stalin who, in the second half of the 1930s, carried out a counter-revolution and stripped the carriers of the Zionist ideology of their power.

In the 1930s and 1940s, no less than 800,000 Jewish Bolsheviks were annihilated under the leadership of Stalin—the elite of the anti-Russian organization which had planned to transform Russia into a Jewish state.

Nearly all Jewish leaders were purged, and the chances of the remaining ones to regain power were reduced to a minimum. The last years of Stalin's life were dedicated to the uprooting of Zionism and the liquidation of the organizations associated with it.

Dr. Platonov added these highly relevant details:

After Stalin's death, everything changed abruptly. The state was taken over by people bent on the restoration of Jewish Bolshevism . . . The renaissance of Zionism continued during the entire government of N. S. Khrushchev.

The situation somewhat improved under Brezhnev, who secretly limited the number of Jews in government positions. As a matter of fact, these measures were rarely put into practice, and both secret and open Zionists found many ways to elude them.

From the 1950s to the 1970s, a powerful fifth column spearheaded by the carriers of the Zionist ideology arose in Russia. Many of its leading figures were sons or grandsons of Bolshevik revolutionaries.

These very people later became the most active elements of the so-called *perestroika*, which led to the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the assumption of political power by the Jews and the transfer of a considerable part of Russia's national wealth to foreign countries.

All of this is largely unknown to American anti-communists, including (as we've noted) even many still who cling to the idea that Stalin was—throughout his life—a tool of international Zionism and Jewry. However, as we have seen, *that was not the case at all*.

Nonetheless, Leon's Trotsky's Jewish Internationale continued to work against Stalin and against Stalinist Russia long after Trotsky's dismissal to Hell and after Stalin's demise, and in no short order they were using the United States as one of their primary bases of operation.

And as I pointed out in *The Judas Goats*, among the foremost American Trotskyites were many well-known names who ultimately emerged in the 1950s as the leaders of the "new" brand of "conservative internationalism" enunciated in the writings of William F. Buckley, Jr. and the inordinate numbers of Jews and "former" Trotskyites who were among Buckley's associates at his *National Review* magazine working assiduously, in their words, to "cleanse" the American nationalist movement of what Buckley called "the fever swamps of anti-Semitism."

Foremost among those promoted by Buckley was no less than James Burnham who, at one point earlier in his career, was considered Leon Trotsky's "chief spokesman" within American "intellectual" circles.

Then, of course, when Stalin began moving against the Trotskyites, Burnham evolved into a so-called "anti-communist liberal" which, effectively, was a euphemism for the more dangerous-sounding (and perhaps more accurate) term "Trotskyite." Then, during World War II, Burnham worked for the Zionist- and Trotskyite-infested Office of Strategic Services, forerunner of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Burnham, the much-touted "intellectual," was not just a critic of Stalinist Russia and of those American nationalists and others who wanted to "contain" the Soviet giant. Instead, Burnham was calling for all-out war against Russia. But among Burnham's critics was eminent American historian Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, who once described Burnham's shrill calls for war as being "most dangerous and un-American."

Despite this record—or actually because of it—Burnham the Trotskyite became "Burnham the Conservative Leader" under the patronage of William F. Buckley, Jr.'s *National Review* magazine, for which Burnham was perhaps the key theoretical writer for slightly more than two decades. Burnham himself died in 1987 but his influence remains critical in the Zionist-Trotskyite-Neo-Conservative circles today.

So it was that those whom we here call "The Buckley Gang" soon proved to be the guiding force within the "conservative" movement, even as old-line American nationalists were being pushed to the sidelines. Today there are more than a few who say that Buckley's *National Review* was a CIA "front"—from the start.

And certainly it was a front—a font—for "ex" Trotskyite thinking, which was now evolving into what we call "neo-conservatism" today. And all throughout that evolution, a devotion to the Zionist Internationale remained consistent.

In his book, *The Neo-Conservative Revolution: Jewish Intellectuals and the Shaping of Public Policy*, Murray Friedman points out that although one of Buckley's associates, Will Herberg, was an Orthodox Jew, Buckley considered Herberg the "theological conscience" of *National Review*, and that "although *National Review* has often been characterized as militantly Catholic and Irish Catholic, five Jews served on the original editorial board."

And it is probably no coincidence to point out that while the American leftist journal, *Partisan Review*—the presumed "counterpoint" to Buckley's *National Review*—backed Trotsky, *Partisan Review* rejected liberalism, according to Friedman, "because the magazine's editors were convinced that too many liberals were pro-Stalinist."

Friedman notes that another famed ex-Trotskyite, Dwight MacDonald, would later describe this position on the part of *Partisan Review* as a form of conservatism "expressed in a radical language" because the magazine really "had no conservative vocabulary."

In other words, the Trotskyites had effectively become "conservatives" even though they didn't use a "conservative vocabulary" to express their newfound point of view; in short, the Trotskyites had now found effective common cause with Buckley's vaunted *National Review*!

Although my associate, Willis A. Carto, was quite on the mark when he dared to suggest, upon the fall of the Soviet empire, that "Communism is dead," there were those relentless hold-outs who refused to face it. "Oh no," cried the John Birchers, "Communism isn't really dead. It's just a ruse. The Reds are going underground, just waiting for the opportunity to strike."

The Birchers and like-minded throwbacks still believe that Josef Stalin is hiding in a Kremlin closet, ready to jump out and say "boo." Yet, ironically, only now are some Birchers coming to recognize that the neo-conservatives—whom they promoted for years in the pages of their journals such as *Review of the News* and *The New American*—are hardly conventional "conservative patriots" in any sense of the term.

The same crowd that rattled its sabers against "the communist threat" has now begun to substitute "the Islamic threat" as the new danger to be vanquished. This is no surprise. For years, during the Cold War, American "conservatives" (especially the Birchers) freely (and falsely) declared repeatedly that the Palestine Liberation Organization was part of a "Soviet-backed terror network," the facts notwithstanding.

It is no accident these myths about the PLO received their widest propagation in the writings of pro-Israel ideologue, Claire Sterling, whose "study," *The Terror Network*, became the virtual bible of the Israeli lobby in its campaign to discredit Palestinian nationalism.

Now, in the name of "fighting terrorism," the conservative anti-communist stalwarts have lent their support to the establishment of a police state here at home as a way of "safeguarding liberty."

In this regard, note that, in the early days of the Cold War, William F. Buckley, Jr.—the soon-to-be self-appointed "leader" of the American "conservative" movement—laid it on the line: Writing in the January 25, 1952 edition of the liberal journal, *Commonweal*, Buckley said he was willing to support "Big Government" for "the duration [of the Cold War] because—he proclaimed—only "a totalitarian bureaucracy within our shores" could assure total victory over the communist menace.

The anti-communist Cold War is now over, but the anti-Islamic (so-called "anti-terrorist") Hot War is now under way. And on American shores we have a government running roughshod on American liberties in the guise of protecting those liberties. *Why should we be surprised?*

The "Communist Threat" never lay within the Communist Party USA which, as *The Judas Goats* pointed out, was controlled at the highest levels by Morris Childs, an asset of J. Edgar Hoover's FBI: a Russian-born Zionist, Childs soured on Soviet-style communism when he detected the echoes of traditional Russian nationalism under Stalin. No, the Communist Party USA, was never a threat, although Hoover—a long-time ally of the Zionist Anti-Defamation League—was manipulating the tiny party for the covert agenda of his behind-the-scenes "advisors."

Nor did the Communist Threat lie even within the furthest "liberal" reaches of the Democratic Party. It was not the New Deal or the Fair Deal or Camelot or the Great Society—or Clintonism or even Obamaism—that brought a unique, updated, American-style brand of Bolshevism of the Trotskyite bent to America. Instead, it was the "compassionate conservatism" of the man who was seriously being hailed during his heyday as "the New Ronald Reagan": George W. Bush.

It is no coincidence that—just days into the war against Iraq—the aforementioned "official" American organ of the Trotskyites—*Partisan Review*—closed its doors. In truth, the little intellectual journal now had no more reason to exist, for its aim of securing power for the Trotskyites had been accomplished through the proverbial "back door."

So, although in America today, the evil force of Jewish Bolshevism—in the form of old-style Trotskyite Communism—has transmogrified into "neo-conservatism and reigns triumphant in the Republican Party (which once exemplified traditional American anti-communism), in modern Russia, in contrast, growing forces stand opposed to Jewish imperialism.

As a consequence, the Jewish-controlled mass media has, for years, targeted Russian leader Vladimir Putin, coming on the heels of a flagrantly anti-Putin propaganda "study" by the Council on Foreign Relations—the

New York affiliate of the Rothschild-controlled Royal Institute of International Affairs in London. The study raised concerns about so-called "anti-democratic" trends in Russia under Putin, who enraged the West with his measures to curtail the power of the plutocratic oligarchs in Russia (many of whom hold joint Russian-Israeli citizenship and who, in several instances, have even gone into exile in Israel).

In fact, as pointed out earlier, a New World Order advocate, David Rothkopf—writing in *Superclass: The Global Power Elite and the World They Are Making*—openly acknowledged that Putin is a leader among an emerging "global network of antiglobalists" who stand opposed to the aims of the "superclass" (that is, the New World Order elite).

However, despite all of the outrage aimed at Putin by the Jewish-controlled media, Edward Lucas noted in his 2008 book, *The New Cold War: Putin's Russia and the Threat to the West* (published by Palgrave MacMillan), that Putin is actually very popular among the Russian people:

Though they lack the freedom to choose their elected representatives, to organize publicly to influence their government, or to change their political systems, never in Russian history have so many Russians lived so well and so freely. That is a proud boast, and one that even those who dislike Russia's current path must honestly acknowledge. . . .

For all his attacks on other freedoms, [Putin] has preserved the ones that the "new Russians" most care about. More than ever before, Russians can plan their lives: they can save, educate themselves, travel, and bring up their children as they like; they can buy anything they can afford, own property at home or abroad, worship (mostly) as they like; they can even live according to their sexual preference (if not always publicly).

In short, Putin is not precisely the thoroughly evil totalitarian autocrat that Putin's critics in New York, London and Tel Aviv (and their flacks in the media, in the Washington "think tanks" and in neo-conservative propaganda outfits) insist on telling the American people.

However, the facts remain a puzzle to many good American anti-communists—such as the folks who populate the membership, for example, of the John Birch Society—and we find the Jewish power interests exploiting legitimate fears of Communism in order to crank up a new Cold War against Russia, precisely because Russia now seems to stand, at least among the European powers, as a possible (even likely) force in opposition to the global Jewish Imperium—the New World Order.

Will Putin be the Titus of the 21st Century? Only time will tell.



A Tightly-Knit Nationalist Network . . .

My longtime friend, Willis Carto (top left), America's premier populist theoretician, coined the term "international nationalism." Willis first introduced me to DeWest Hooker (top right), who became a good friend, providing me insights I value immensely. Hooker and Carto were also friends with Swiss banker Francois Genoud (bottom right), the foremost geopolitical strategist for post-World War II cooperation among like-minded nationalists around the globe, and with Lawrence Dennis (bottom left), an unrivaled intellect whom Willis credits for shaping much of his own world view. It was Dennis who paved the way for Hooker to meet with former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy (center), at which time Kennedy outlined to Hooker the Kennedy Dynasty's secret agenda: breaking the back of Jewish power in America. My own philosophy—beyond question—has been influenced by each of those in this gallery of figures who have been in the front line of the battle against the New World Order.

CHAPTER THIRTY-THREE

Who Really Won World War II? The Inside Story of the Kennedy Dynasty And the Reality of Jewish Power in America

We now thus find ourselves in the 21st Century and the problem of anti-Semitism rages as much today as it ever did. Perhaps even more so—if the Jews are to be believed. But we would not be where we are now were it not for the turbulent events of the century that came before.

And when all is said and done, there will be no question that—at least in one definite respect—the Jews are absolutely right: Adolf Hitler and National Socialist Germany and World War II and, yes, "The Holocaust," will ultimately be considered central to our understanding of the 20th Century and everything that has followed.

That's why, as we begin wrapping up our study of the problem of anti-Semitism, I want to take a deep historical digression and relate the fascinating story of a remarkable individual I was pleased to call a friend and who, in a unique way, played a secret and pivotal (and actually bizarre) role in shaping the direction of American—and world—history.

The story I am about to relate is very much a part of what can only be called "hidden history"—I have told parts of it before in other places and in other contexts—and in many respects it is so extraordinarily inflammatory that it will both intrigue and outrage so many people (depending upon their point of view) precisely because it says so much about how political affairs really do work behind the scenes.

But more importantly—and this is the real point of all of this—it demonstrates, indisputably, that the Jewish Presence and the problem of anti-Semitism is very much the root of the most controversial issues of our times: Money, Power, War & Peace.

That having been said, by way of introduction, I will note that over my many years in the American nationalist movement I have made many good friends and met some truly memorable people. But among them stands out one individual in particular: the legendary DeWest Hooker—a longtime behind-the-scenes figure in the nationalist movement—who died at age 81 in Washington, D.C. on September 22, 1999.

I was first introduced to "West" in 1984 by our mutual friend, my longtime employer Willis A. Carto, who had known West going back to the early 1950s. I will always thank Willis for making the introduction, for, along with Willis himself, West became one of the foremost influences upon my own political and philosophical outlook. And as you will see, West's life experiences (and his dynamic personality) made him someone who was simply not to be ignored. And I miss him a lot.

But before we come to the most interesting—and telling—aspects of the story of DeWest Hooker, it is well worth taking a look at Hooker himself, for his own background was, to say the least, unique and, through many twists and turns, always intertwined him with the problem of anti-Semitism and its impact on our world today.

Born to wealth and privilege—a descendant of one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence—and later married to an heir to the Conde Nast publishing empire, Hooker was a graduate of Cornell and a veteran of World War II, a war that he believed then and until his dying day was a war that need not and should not have been fought. Hooker devoted much of his personal fortune to fighting for the nationalist cause that he never abandoned.

In his early years, the floridly handsome Hooker was not only a Broadway actor but also an advertising model appearing in advertisements for Chesterfield cigarettes and wearing an eye patch in the famous Hathaway shirt advertisements. However, Hooker gave up a promising career on the stage, after having been offered Henry Fonda's lead role in the road tour of the Broadway hit, *Command Decision*, preferring to work behind the scenes in the entertainment industry.

Hooker ultimately went to work as a talent agent for the Music Corporation of America (MCA) and in the early 1950's was one of the highest-paid talent agents in America—in fact, he was said to be the highest-paid "Gentile" talent agent in America. His focus was on the burgeoning arena of television production.

Hooker was particularly proud of his efforts to promote "black entertainment" for "black audiences," encouraging the artistic endeavors of black singers and actors. At the same time, however, Hooker thoroughly rejected the concept that black music and black culture should be promoted to white audiences, a guiding principle of the "multi-cultural" music and motion pictures promoters of today.

(Hooker was particularly enthusiastic about the increasing prominence in the mid-1980s of Minister Louis Farrakhan, leader of the Nation of Islam, and I first met Farrakhan while accompanying Hooker to a by-invitation-only rally of the Nation of Islam in Washington, D.C. in 1985.)

For a period, one of the MCA contracts under Hooker's domain was that of a former "B" movie actor-turned-television star, Ronald Reagan—although that detail is left out of Reagan's official biographies in light of Hooker's future "infamy" and reputation as an "anti-Semite."

However, a "secret" description of Hooker's relationship with Reagan's rise to prominence appears in a little-known book entitled *The King Maker*, published in 1972—eight years before Reagan reached the presidency. Written by Henry Denker, a well-known New York writer,

producer and director with wide "inside" knowledge of the show business industry, *The King Maker* was a *roman à clef* (that is, a "fictional" novel based on real-life characters and events, thinly disguised). Everyone knew it was about the behind-the-scenes story of Ronald Reagan's political and financial dealings with the MCA agency and how those dealings helped bring Reagan to the governorship of California.

The book is not easy to find. That may well be because of the fact that—if you read between the lines (or not even between the lines)—you'll discover some unpleasant things about Reagan and the people (the Jewish "Supermob" described earlier in these pages) who made Reagan into the American political powerhouse of the 20th century.

Hooker was the real-life model for one of the characters in the book—"Carl Brewster"—a frankly anti-Jewish television industry executive and let it be said, frankly, that West was unabashedly and frankly anti-Jewish. And he would be the first to admit it, no questions asked. A powerfully-built man, Hooker was fearless and not afraid to make his position known. He threw more than a few punches in his day.

In *The King Maker*, Reagan is "Jeff Jefferson," a has-been former movie actor catapulted into the California governorship through his association with Dr. Irwin Cone, the founder of a mob-connected book-ing agency, the Talent Corporation of America (TCA), which emerges a political force in its own right. Denker's "Dr. Cone" is the real-life Dr. Jules Stein, and TCA is really—you guessed it—the Music Corporation of America, better known as the media giant MCA (now a subsidiary of the ever-growing Bronfman empire). Evidently the book was too much on the mark, so much so that Dr. Stein's real life partner, Lew Wasserman, described the novel as "a piece of garbage" even though Wasserman isn't even characterized in the novel at all.

In 1986, organized crime writer, Dan Moldea wrote his own book that was no *roman à clef*, but was, in fact, a controversial non-fiction work that told the same story told in Denker's *The King Maker*. However, Moldea's book was more explosively—and perhaps more accurately—titled *Dark Victory: Ronald Reagan, MCA, and the Mob*.

In any case, Hooker's anti-Semitism did not go over well with his bosses, Lew Wasserman and Jules Stein, and ultimately Hooker had a parting of the ways with MCA (still, though, to have his MCA years memorialized in Denker's book).

However, Hooker, through his own ingenuity, walked away from MCA a very rich man and was able to outwit that Jewish monopoly to the point that Hooker was later described in print by Jewish show business columnist (and veteran Anti-Defamation League shill) Walter Winchell as the only person who ever outfoxed Lew Wasserman.

In personal conversations, however, Winchell was known to say, more candidly, that Hooker was the "only Goy" (i.e. non-Jew) to have accomplished that feat, although Winchell's language was far more guttural in describing what Hooker had done to his former employer.

In any case, during the 1950s, Hooker immersed himself in nationalist affairs and, not incidentally, one of Hooker's foremost protégés was George Lincoln Rockwell, founder of the American Nazi Party. In his memoirs, *This Time the World*, Rockwell credits Hooker as being a major influence on his thinking. In fact, Rockwell dedicated the book to Hooker, along with Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy and General Douglas MacArthur. Hooker, Rockwell declared, was the one "who taught me to know the cunning and evil ways of the enemy."

And so, with intense "inside" knowledge of the burgeoning television industry under his belt, Hooker moved toward setting up a "fourth" television network in the mid-1950's, much to the distress of the Jewish media elite. Hooker candidly admitted that his project was designed to be the first "non-Jewish-controlled" television network.

Hooker wanted the new network to be totally divorced from Jewish money and influence. And so, not surprisingly, learning of Hooker's project, the ADL devoted a two-page spread in its bulletin in 1954 to "exposing" Hooker under the title "The Case of the Charming Bigot."

The title itself was quite revealing about Hooker: Even the ADL, so disposed to smearing people and casting aspersions on their character, was forced to acknowledge that Hooker was possessed of an engaging, classically larger-than-life personality that just wouldn't quit.

Ultimately, in 1956, through the good offices of their mutual friend, famed nationalist theoretician Lawrence Dennis—also, by the way, a friend of Willis Carto—Hooker was able to arrange private meeting in Palm Beach, Florida with retired Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy, father of then-Sen. John F. Kennedy (D-Mass.) who was then actively seeking the Democratic Party's vice presidential nomination.

After a game of golf, Kennedy and Hooker got down to business. Hooker was there to solicit Kennedy—a former movie mogul himself—for Kennedy's financial, political and personal backing for Hooker's proposed "fourth" network free of Jewish influence.

After Hooker made his presentation to the retired ambassador, Kennedy's response was supportive in spirit, but Old Joe made his final position clear during their four-hour conference.

What Kennedy said to Hooker is, in my personal estimation, one of the most revealing and extraordinary things that I have ever heard about the reality of Jewish power and the consequences of American involvement in World War II. Hooker recalled Kennedy's words:

Joe admitted that when he was ambassador to England that he had been pro-Hitler. However, in Kennedy's words, "we" lost the war. By "we" he didn't mean the United States. When Kennedy said "we," he meant the non-Jews. Joe Kennedy believed that it was the Jews who had won World War II.

Kennedy said, "I've done everything I can to fight the Jewish power over this country. I tried to stop World War II, but I failed. I've made all the money I need and now I'm passing everything I've learned on to my sons."

"I don't go with the 'loser,'" Kennedy told me. "I've joined the 'winners.' I'm going to work with the Jews. I'm teaching my boys the whole score and they're going to work with the Jews. I'm going to make Jack the first Irish Catholic President of the United States and if it means working with the Jews, so be it. I'm in sympathy with what you're doing, Hooker," Kennedy said, "but I'm not going to do anything that will ruin Jack's chances to become president."

Despite this, however, Kennedy told Hooker that *there was a bigger agenda at work*: Once the Kennedy family achieved the White House and consolidated their power they planned toward moving to breaking the back of Jewish power in America—by hitting the Jews where it would truly make a difference: in the financial arena.

In fact, Kennedy said, the intent was to move against the Federal Reserve banking monopoly controlled by the international plutocratic Jewish interests. A former banker, Kennedy—one of the richest men in America—understood money if he understood anything.

And while today there are those who circulate the false story that while president JFK did move against the Federal Reserve by issuing debt-free U.S. Notes—outside the Federal Reserve's purview—that were withdrawn from circulation by Lyndon Johnson immediately after JFK's assassination, this story is just not true. It is actually a combined product of wishful thinking, misinterpretation of actual events, and an outright refusal to face some historical facts.

In reality, the Johnson administration itself released U.S. Notes into the American economy in 1966—following a long-standing congressional mandate that had been on the books for some time. And for those who have any doubts, a simple check of currency dealers on the Internet will demonstrate that such U.S. Notes were indeed introduced into the economy and many of them can still be obtained today.

The complete (and accurate) story behind the legend of "JFK's Greenbacks"—which never existed, sad to say—can be found in my

book *Final Judgment*. And while I take no pleasure in throwing a wet blanket on this popular legend, I remain committed to the facts, no matter how much they may upset so many good people who have placed so much faith in this popular myth—and a myth is what it is.

In any event, despite the myth that continues to reverberate to this day, the fact is that—as Hooker had learned—the Kennedy dynasty did indeed have the Federal Reserve System in its gunsites.

But there's still more to the story of the meeting between Joe Kennedy and DeWest Hooker. As they parted, Hooker asked Kennedy if there was anything he could do to help the Kennedy family's agenda and Kennedy—the old politician that he was—said this:

Yes, as a matter of fact, there is something you can do. I'd like you to use your contacts in the right-wing. Have them start publishing articles accusing Jack of being controlled by the Jews, of being a Jewish puppet. This will have the effect of neutralizing Jewish opposition to Jack (because of me).

The Jews know my views and naturally they'll assume that Jack is a chip off the old block. If the right wing starts hitting Jack this will give the Jews second thoughts—at least the ones who do the voting.

Hooker promised Kennedy he would do what he could. And being a man of his word, Hooker did influence his right-wing contacts as Kennedy had asked. Hooker encouraged his friend, Nazi leader Rockwell, and other "right wingers" to smear John F. Kennedy as JFK's father had suggested. His efforts succeeded.

As one chronicle of the 1960 campaign noted: "The American Nazi Party helped too by throwing its support to Richard Nixon—'Nazis for Nixon, Kikes for Kennedy' was one of its slogans."

This, of course, was inspired by JFK's father and carried out through the good offices of DeWest Hooker and his Nazi friend, although the historian who wrote of it probably had no idea it was indirectly the work of Joe Kennedy. And for his part, Hooker always said, "As far as I'm concerned, it was my work that got Johnny Kennedy in the White House." And his claim was not off the mark, inasmuch as American Jewish leaders claimed themselves at the time that it was Jewish support for JFK that gave him his narrow victory over Nixon in the 1960 election.

This interesting—and revealing—episode is not likely to be memorialized at the John F. Kennedy Library at Harvard or in any friendly biographies of the Kennedy family. However, there is no doubt the Jewish elite had a fairly good idea of what was going on behind the scenes.

Ultimately, New York State Attorney General (and later U.S. Senator) Jacob Javits, a corrupt and vicious Jewish ally of the ADL, issued an injunction preventing Hooker from raising funds for his "fourth" network, thereby killing the project on behalf of the other Zionist-run networks and preserving Jewish power over the television industry.

Hooker left the United States in 1958 and went into self-imposed exile in Italy where he made a fortune in the soda bottling business, but not one to be counted out, he returned to the United States in the early 1980s to resume his political endeavors, at which time I was honored to make his acquaintance which soon became a valued friendship.

For many years thereafter, Hooker worked behind the scenes in an energetic effort to set in place an international petroleum distribution network—in concert with sympathetic interests in the Arab world—that would provide funding for the American nationalist movement. Unfortunately, however, his efforts were sabotaged by figures in a certain Arab regime who had been co-opted by Israel's Mossad. In fact, one of Hooker's working partners in the project was murdered.

Hooker had no desire whatsoever to reap any profit for himself from the venture which, if successful, would have, by his estimate, provided a minimum of \$10,000,000 per year for the nationalist cause.

Although West was quite physically fit, almost until his death, Hooker's sharp mind fell victim to the onset of age and his memory began to fail. This was a great tragedy for it prevented him from ever putting down the complete record of his remarkable career in writing or on video, although, fortunately, some of his writings have survived.

Amazingly, although he suffered for five years from the prostate cancer which spread throughout his body and ultimately killed him, Hooker was quite active and just before his death he came to a public meeting in Virginia where I was the featured speaker. His appearance earned Hooker a final attack upon him by his enemies in a report about the meeting by the Southern Poverty Law Center. West was delighted to know his endeavors were still being noticed.


"Jesus was no sissy," West would often say. "He marched right in and threw the money changers out of the temple."

I am thus pleased to commemorate the life of my good friend West Hooker, for personal reasons to be sure, but most especially because of the fact that what Hooker bequeathed us—his memories of that historic meeting with Joseph P. Kennedy—does tell us so much about the nature of Jewish power and the impact it has had on the course of mankind.

As Kennedy said, it was the Jews who won World War II.

And now we must ask if we are to fight—yet again—another Jewish War of Survival. *That is the pivotal question of the 21st Century . . .*

A childhood memory . . .



While the Jewish-controlled media would prefer that American children “remember” World War II through images of Jewish suffering, the image above is the one that had the most impact upon me as a child. It illustrates the impending beheading of Sgt. Leonard Siffleet, an Australian commando captured in New Guinea by the Japanese. Young Siffleet is also shown at inset. This image staggered my imagination precisely because my own father had fought in the Pacific and he, too, could have suffered that same fate as a consequence of that needless Jewish War of Survival. We must fight to prevent further such wars.

“We Must Destroy Amalek . . .”

Because the Israelite nation was entrusted by God to teach morality and righteousness to the world, we must fight against those who would destroy us and destroy our morality. Since in any given war there is only one victor, it behooves us to fight to win . . .

—American-born Shlomo Riskin,
chief rabbi of Efrat, Israel

CHAPTER THIRTY-FOUR

The Jewish Presence Today: Must the World Be Forced to Fight Another Jewish War of Survival?

While it is quite in fashion for people of all political persuasions to freely assert that “Hitler wanted to conquer the world” (which, by the way, is not true) the very idea that a particular group, namely the Jews, might have the same thing in mind is considered absolutely outrageous and beyond the pale, an insidious “conspiracy theory” of the worst sort—vulgar, even insane, anti-Semitism.

Yet, it is so very clear: The Jews do seek world domination. They dream of a Jewish Imperium: the New World Order.

The idea of a single group or nation wanting (and working) to take command of the planet is not really so extraordinary.

In fact, if truth be told, this desire is a healthy instinct of ethno-centrism and it was central to the thinking of the ancient Romans and the Greeks and even to Genghis Khan.

Yet today, so many rush forward—in a mode of political correctness—to say with passion that “Not all Jews think this way.”

But this *is* true—undeniably true: *As a group*, the Jews do work together to advance their ultimate goal—long ago enunciated and still maintained as a Jewish aim today: global conquest.

In these pages—and in so many other works that have emerged from all manner of writers over the centuries—we have seen just the tip of the iceberg, the evidence that international Jewry does seek global power.

To deny it is stupidity and folly.

John Locke put the matter in quite simple perspective in his *Treatises on Government*, I when he wrote:

The great question which—in all ages—has disturbed mankind, and brought on . . . the greatest part of those mischiefs which have ruined cities, depopulated countries, and disordered the peace of the world, has been, not whether there be power in the world, nor whence it came, but who should have it.

The religious writings of the Jews have always been rife with proclamations of Jewish superiority and candid expressions of the ultimate Jewish intent to reign supreme on this planet.

Although Jewish apologists insist that these writings have been “misinterpreted,” a brief sampling of just a few of the notable Jewish spiritual proclamations in this regard make it all too obvious that the words are not being miscast by anti-Semites or by wild-eyed conspiracy theorists.

For example, within a wide array of confirmed Jewish religious teachings we find such gems as these:

The Jews are human beings, but the nations of the world are not human beings but beasts.

When the Messiah comes every Jew will have 2800 slaves.

Jehovah created the non-Jew in human form so that the Jew would not have to be served by beasts. The non-Jew is consequently an animal in human form, and condemned to serve the Jew day and night.

As soon as the King Messiah will declare himself, He will destroy Rome and make a wilderness of it. Thorns and weeds will grow in the Pope's palace.

Then He will start a merciless war on non-Jews and will overpower them. He will slay them in masses, kill their kings and lay waste the whole Roman land.

He will say to the Jews: "I am the King Messiah for whom you have been waiting. Take the silver and gold from the Goyim."

All property of other nations belongs to the Jewish nation, which, consequently, is entitled to seize upon it without any scruples. An orthodox Jew is not bound to observe principles of morality towards people of other tribes. He may act contrary to morality, if profitable to himself or to Jews in general.

Can there seriously be any doubt—on the part of even the most skeptical—what these writings mean, what their intent clearly is?

And in reviewing the global Jewish role today, we see this agenda being carried out in no uncertain terms.

This is a tragedy.

It is no wonder we continue to face the Problem of anti-Semitism.

And we should not be surprised that the world is lurching ever further toward another global conflict—precisely because of the intrigues of the international Jewish power interests.

While a famed Israeli rabbi, Zvi Yehudah Kook once proclaimed that "The entire Israeli army is holy," his words were not just the rhetoric of an extremist. Rather, as American Jewish writer Milton Viorst has pointed out, this rabbi's beliefs "became unusually popular, creating a movement that became Israel's most dynamic political force."

And it is indisputably such a mindset that has free rein in the thinking of the global Jewish elite today. They truly believe that they represent the will of God—the Jewish People are their own Messiah—and that they will ultimately come to power on this planet. And they work in so many ways on so many levels to achieve that end. They perceive themselves "holy warriors" fighting for the Jewish Agenda and that the Jewish Presence is the guiding force upon which humanity's future rests.

Milton Himmelfarb, a longtime "macher" at the American Jewish Committee—and brother of Gertrude Himmelfarb, wife of Irving Kristol, the godfather of the American Trotskyite persuasion known as "neo-conservatism"—wrote of the Jewish infatuation with the ever-present Jewish role in world affairs. In *The Jews of Modernity* he noted that "Each Jew knows how thoroughly ordinary he is. Yet taken together, we seem caught up in things great and inexplicable. Big things seem to happen around us and to us."

In other words, for all intents and purposes, Himmelfarb is giving credence to the oft-expressed point of view of alleged anti-Semites who suggest that the Jews do think and act as a group and that it is often hard to separate "individual" Jews or the proverbial "little" Jews from the organized Jewish community as a whole.

While good people do rightly attempt to separate each individual Jew from the misdeeds of the Jews as a group, for, obviously, not all Jews give their support to each and every action, for example, of the state of Israel or to the Jewish lobby in America, those Jews still remain largely silent and effectively give their endorsement to the very outrages that shock the world at large.

Those Jews who do dare to speak out, sadly, are so few and far between. And while they themselves often take issue with critics of Israel who use generalized terminology such as "the Jews" to denounce the actions of Israel, the truth is that it is "the Jews" in Israel who are responsible for the persecution and killing of Christians and Muslims in the Middle East and are acting indeed on behalf of the Jewish Agenda.

The German anti-Semite Wilhelm Marr—who has often been credited with coining the term "anti-Semitism"—actually foreshadowed the aforementioned Himmelfarb when he put it bluntly (and perhaps, it seems, correctly) saying that "The Jewish Question is the axis around which the wheel of world history revolves."

Even Martin Buber, the famed Austrian-born Jewish philosopher, was moved to reflect that "Everything we Jews do takes place on a stage." And in Buber's perception—he being one of those Zionists who perceived the geographical state of Israel as a spiritual and cultural center for Judaism, even as the far grander Jewish Agenda was being played out on

the global stage—this was indeed the place of the Jews, as a people, in the history of civilization.

But Jostein Gardner, the revered Norwegian novelist, spoke for the rest of the peoples of the earth when he said of the Jews that “To act as God’s chosen people is not only foolish and arrogant, it is a crime against humanity. We call it racism.”

The problem is much bigger, even in the Jewish perspective, than simple “anti-Semitism.” The Jews have come to believe that even people who are not necessarily anti-Semitic, *per se*, but who have somehow put themselves in opposition to some form of the overall Jewish Agenda, are also a threat to the Jews.

In his much-heralded 2010 work, *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-Semitism in England* (published by Oxford University Press) prominent English-based Jewish attorney Anthony Julius laid this thesis candidly on the line when he wrote that “while every anti-Semite is an enemy of the Jews, not every enemy of the Jews is an anti-Semite.”

In short, in the estimation of this respected legal giant, even people who do not consider themselves (nor are they, in fact) “anti-Semitic” can somehow still be considered an “enemy of the Jews.”

Julius says that even “chants at demonstrations”—for example, persons denouncing the evil deeds of Israel—have the impact of “impairing the quality of Jewish life, inducting apprehension among Jews and promoting feelings of insecurity.” He even goes so far as to equate these horrible “chants at demonstrations” with desecrations of Jewish graves. And this from one said to be among the world’s foremost legal minds!

Among other things, Julius asserts that beliefs about Jews or Jewish projects “that are both false and hostile” constitute anti-Semitism. What he clearly means is that anything that is critical of Jews or Jewish projects is, by its critical nature, thus “both false and hostile.”

In other words—and this is hardly an exaggeration—he is suggesting, quite simply, that Jews can do no wrong and that to suggest that they *are* capable of wrongdoing is anti-Semitism.

In fact, Julius asserts that those whom he has collectively villainized as anti-Semites are just plain “wrong about Jews”—no matter how correct their complaints about the Jews may be—and that such concerns are “anti-Semitic” and that “all [his word, to repeat it: *all*] “anti-Semitic accounts of Jews are fictional in the received sense of being false.”

What Julius is saying is this: “If you say good things about Jews, those things are true. If you say bad things about Jews, those things are false and thus anti-Semitic.”

Julius even alleges that Bram Stoker’s legendary horror novel, *Dracula*, was an anti-Semitic concoction! According to Julius, although

the subject of vampirism had long been of deep interest in European literary circles, commemorated in poetry and fiction, it was Stoker who gave the topic “an anti-Semitic complexion.”

While Julius admits that “nowhere is Dracula identified as a Jew” and that what Julius perceives as the “anti-Semitism” in the novel has a “somewhat blurred, out-of-focus quality,” he still asserts that “the insinuations of Dracula’s affinity with the Semitic are many, and relentlessly pressed.”

The fact the vampire seeks blood alone is enough to prove the anti-Semitism since—after all—Jews had been accused of using the blood of Gentile children in their religious rituals (a charge, as we noted earlier, that first originated with the Jews themselves, who made those accusations about the early Christians—a point the Jews prefer to be forgotten).

And that Dracula recoils from the cross of Christ, and that Dracula describes himself as a “stranger in a strange land,” and that Dracula has a “smile that Judas in Hell might be proud of” Julius finds to be not-so-subtle manifestations of anti-Semitism in Stoker’s work, that all of this together, shows what a vile anti-Semite Bram Stoker really was—a clever devil though, who never once suggested flatly that Dracula was a Jew.

No, according to Julius’s fevered imagination, Stoker wrote that whole novel as a very sinister allegory about the poor persecuted Jews that would somehow, we presume, help propagate anti-Semitism among all those readers who were going to push and shove their way into Borders Books and Barnes and Noble to get the latest anti-Semitic novel, posturing as a tale of vampirism.

What’s more, according to Julius, Dracula’s skill at shape-shifting, changing into a bat or or a wolf at will is “akin to the Jew’s skill at social climbing, name-changing, etc, as well as the more sinister arts of self-concealment and conspiracy.” (Talk about Jewish paranoia!)

It is interesting that Dracula does, as Julius points out, describe himself as being of a “conquering race,” and from what we have seen from Jewish writings throughout history—going back to the Talmud and even before to the Old Testament teachings dismissed to the dungheap by Christ Himself—the Jews do indeed perceive of themselves as such.

And that, as we have said, is precisely at the root of anti-Semitism and it always has been.

Now, however, we have even the likes of a distinguished English-based Jewish barrister rising up to say that even people who are not “anti-Semitic” can still be considered an “enemy” of the Jews!

And indeed the Jews—as a group—know that there are many who stand in their way, that there are so many who reject the Jewish Agenda in one form or another. It has always been so. And the truth is that all manner of groups and peoples and nations throughout history have been

at odds with one another. That's the sad bottom line of human existence. But only the Jews—and *only* the Jews—have made conflict and opposition the foundation of their very being, their intellectual mindset, the underlying nature of their religious and cultural teachings.

The vile Old Testament legend outlined in the Book of Esther, detailing the story of one Persian—Haman—who stood against Jewish intrigues has become a singular part of the Jewish lore regarding their relations with the Goyim. Haman was but one man, but he has come to epitomize the ever-present Gentile Enemy in the Jewish world view.

In 1999, Rabbi Elaine Rose Glickman, a graduate of Hebrew Union College, published the revealing *Haman and the Jews: A Portrait From Rabbinic Literature*—issued by Jason Aaronson, Inc., Northvale, New Jersey and Jerusalem—reflecting upon the tale of Esther and her uncle, Mordechai, and its importance to the future role of the Jewish people. Glickman's words are a clarion call for war, a strategic plan for combating the perceived enemies of the Jews.

Esther and Mordechai's deeds mirror some of the tactics employed against Israel's enemies today.

While Jews for many years were largely unable to fight effectively against anti-Jewish prejudice and actions, most Western Jews today can wage at least moderate campaigns against anti-Semitism.

While the means for fighting Jew hatred today focus more on public relations and community outreach than palace intrigue and horse-riding, Esther and Mordechai provide an encouraging example of religious faith combined with strategic activity. Even as we trust God to shield us from modern foes—from David Duke to Louis Farrakhan—still we diligently work against them on a practical level as well.

Despite our work so far, however, we have certainly not accomplished the final messianic victory over evil . . .

While God will blot out Amalek in the World to Come—that is, while God will ultimately blot out all trace of evil and bring the Messianic Age—he will do so only after we have blotted out Amalek in this world.

It is all too clear that we have not done our part; for blotting out Amalek is about much more than fighting anti-Semitism. . . .

Although we know that we have not yet seen the final victory of God and Israel, we must work to blot out Amalek and Haman and achieve that final messianic triumph.

In short, the Jewish people remain committed to the destruction of those perceived to be their enemies—by any means possible.

One of those means could very well be a world war. And with what is happening in the Middle East today—as a direct result of Jewish machinations in the effort to frustrate Iran's right to defend itself and to participate in the nuclear arena—that could well be in the offing.

Writing in the July/August 2008 issue of *Moment* magazine, no less than respected Jewish icon Judea Pearl said frankly:

If Iran wins this race, a bloody war is imminent, commencing with 800 missiles per day on Haifa and Tel Aviv from emboldened Syria and Hezbollah. Israel will have to take defensive action, perhaps preemptive, perhaps even nuclear, and a sizable chunk of the world is likely to go up in flames, together, of course, with the Palestinian dream of independence.

This is a no-holds-barred threat that the world needs to consider. And the fact that Israel is now one of the planet's top five nuclear powers is all the more reason to take this threat seriously.

It is no coincidence, I suppose, that as Yale professor Amy Chua put it in her book, *Day of Empire: How Hyperpowers Rise to Global Dominance—And Why They Fail*, that the United States was "a new Jerusalem" for Albert Einstein and the other Jewish scientists whose work "led to the development of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, giving America the world's first nuclear weapons.

"Perhaps never in world history has an effusion of immigrant talent," she noted, "so immediately translated into a scientific advance and military advantage of such planet-altering magnitude."

It was for this good reason that my late friend, the magnificent dean of American populist historians, Eustace Mullins, referred to the atomic bomb as "The Jewish Hell Bomb," for that is what it is.

And it presents a very real threat to the survival of mankind.

Is the world about to see—to fight—yet another Jewish War of Survival? I pray to God not.

My father and his three brothers—*every single one of the Piper boys*—served in the American armed forces in World War II. And thank God they all survived.

Too many good Americans died in that Hellish war. Too many good Americans were maimed for life in that Jewish War of Survival. Too many innocent people from all over the planet suffered as a consequence of that disastrous and unnecessary madness that is hailed today in our history books as a "good war." What utter Hellish nonsense!

I can recall (as if it were yesterday) my very real terror—as a child—when my father said to me one cold, windy winter night when he was reminiscing about his years in the Pacific and reflecting about his mother, my dear grandmother: “Just think of dear old Nina sitting up here in this big old house all alone while all of her boys were overseas.”

And I can also remember the first time that I saw the horrific picture of an Australian prisoner of war, captured in New Guinea, Sgt. Leonard Siffleet, blindfolded and bound, sitting on his knees, about to be beheaded by a Japanese executioner. That, I thought at the time, could have been my father who was, alone among his brothers, the one who fought in the Pacific. And I have tears in my eyes as I think of this, even now.

In truth, because of the Jewish role in causing the series of events, in so many ways, that led to the outbreak of World War II, this poor Sgt. Siffleet was a victim not of the Japanese, but of the Jews. I say that *without hesitation* and with utter candor.

While the Jews would have my terrors of World War II be influenced by the famous pictures of masses of dead bodies in the Dachau concentration camp (where no gas chamber was ever utilized and where most of the inmates died of disease and starvation), it is instead the image of this young Australian that haunts me, as it always has: one of the millions of non-Jews who fought and died in that unnecessary world war.

And to think, today, that I now know in retrospect—having learned so much in my lifetime—that World War II was nothing more than a foolish and needless venture, a war that should not have been fought. It was yet another Jewish War of Survival.

Had my father died in that war—and for his efforts, he did spend several months in a veterans’ hospital, having contracted malaria in the Pacific—or, to put it bluntly, had he been parted with his reproductive organs (as many soldiers were), I would be not here today to write these words. And that, too, for me, is an arresting thought.

Note, by the way, that my father enlisted in the Marines. He was not drafted. And he did not have to enlist. He was a railroad engineer at the time the war erupted and railroad engineers were exempt from the draft. But he served—not “his country” as the Jews would have us believe, but instead he served the interests of the Jews.

And by the end of his own too-short life my father came to understand this and to understand the Problem of anti-Semitism.

In fact, in my own family, the Problem of anti-Semitism caused a grievous rift. My beloved Uncle Bud—my father’s oldest brother—was a good and decent man who was a Navy pilot and, in fact, one of the first commercial airline pilots in America. A respected figure in Trans World Airlines—who was drafted as TWA’s top pilot to instruct Howard Hughes

how to man one of TWA’s new jets (when Hughes owned the airline)—Bud retired after a long career flying in Asia, Africa and Latin America, a remarkable career by all respects. I think it was safe to say that he considered me his “favorite nephew.”

However, after Bud’s daughter married a Jewish doctor, Bud’s wife, Velma—who proclaimed the Jews to be God’s Chosen People—drafted a formal letter of dismissal to me, denouncing me for my opposition to Israel, and forced Bud to co-sign the letter.

To her credit, my dear Mother (very much to my surprise, I must say) was so disgusted by Velma’s actions that she wrote a letter back to them, denouncing them for their ignominious behavior.

The punchline is this: Velma’s daughter, who married the Hebrew physician, has since become a vocal public critic of Israel.

I suppose my father’s sister Gloria—a beautiful and dynamic lady, a straight-shooting, no-nonsense woman of considerable means who spent much of her life traveling the world—put it all in perspective when she remarked: “Velma was known as a bitch around town.”

But that little anecdote from my own family’s history does say a lot about the Jewish Presence and its impact on things both big and small. And for our purposes here we are concerned with the Big Picture.

We cannot understand why the problem of anti-Semitism is so integral to the events in our world today—or to recognize that it is a distinct consequence of the Jewish outlook toward all others—until we once and for all acknowledge that the Jews do think differently and that, as a direct result, they do not place value on non-Jewish life, even as they tout Jewish life to be utmost and supreme.

The Jewish Presence is always with us, in more ways than we perhaps realize. And as much as the Jewish people are forever trumpeting their own humor (and passing it on to the rest of the world through Hollywood and in other media), it probably is worth noting the fact that Jewish Humor, in many respects, does demonstrate how truly different the self-proclaimed Chosen People of God are from all others.

I cannot help but recall one occasion where a friend of mine and I were, as I imagine the Brits might say, “attending the cinema.” My friend—like me—was “in tune” to the ways of our Jewish brethren and the particular film presentation was the product of a Jewish writer and director—Mel Brooks, I do believe—and in the course of the production there happened to be more than a few “laugh lines” that only a Jew—or someone who understood the Jewish mindset or Jewish affairs—would recognize or otherwise find funny.

As it was, in that entire movie house (in the small city in central Pennsylvania where I was born), my friend and I were the only ones who

erupted in laughter when the Jewish-oriented laugh-lines came forth. Obviously, there were no Jews in that audience.

And what was so memorable to both of us—as we noted afterward in discussing the underlying Jewish nature of the comedy—was that, as we were laughing, more than a few people in that theater were turning and looking at us in disgust, clearly not understanding why we were laughing and thinking that we were somehow being disruptive! These Goyim simply did not understand the Jewish basis of the humor.

Quite in contrast, some years later, when I was attending the showing of another film rife with “Jewish humor” (explicable only to Jews and those who understand the Jews) in a Washington, DC theater, there were considerably more guffaws from the audience, precisely because of the fact that there were Jews in the audience.

The point is this: Jews and Gentiles are different and think differently. Jews know it and say it—and say it proudly and with emphasis. But if we “Goyim” say it, we are tarred as . . . anti-Semites.

And I will also tell you of this. Once, many years ago, when a friend of mine and I were engaged in a late-night drinking endeavor in a New Orleans club, the Audubon Tavern—which happened to be a favorite watering hole for the Jewish students from nearby Tulane University (a Deep South outpost for many New York Jews, as any New York Jew or any New Orleans native knows)—I witnessed a most remarkable thing.

It was about 2:00 o’clock in the morning and the bar was rocking. And the deejay set the place ablaze when he spun, to the great delight of the assembled patrons, a recording of the song “Springtime for Hitler” from the soundtrack of the film, *The Producers*, the amazing (and amusing) work of the aforementioned Mel Brooks.

From his platform above the crowd, the deejay—who looked quite Jewish—energetically began giving the infamous “Hitler Salute” and throughout the bar equally enthusiastic Jewish lads and lassies returned the salute, over and over again. It was almost as if a 1930’s Nuremberg rally had come to life before me.

I turned to my friend, Louis, and remarked: “This says very much about the Jews.” And even Louis—who was not anti-Semitic (and who may have had a tinge of Jewish blood himself—nodded knowingly, with a bright smile.

The Jews really do love Hitler in their own peculiar way. Perhaps that’s why they are always talking about him. Non-stop.

As far as the dear old Audubon Tavern—now gone—is concerned this Jewish funspot is recalled on the Internet as being “famous for underage drinking, bar brawls, public urination, puke on the sidewalk, and drunk girls getting carried out in a stupor.”

Ah—Jewish Culture.

And no, don’t say I’m anti-Semitic for saying that.

Even *Forward*, the distinguished Jewish newspaper, once favorably noted of the famous Judeo-centric Hollywood film, *Meet the Fockers*—a thoroughly outrageous farce dripping in no-holds-barred toilet “humor” and all manner of vulgarisms (not to mention the movie title alone) including a scene of someone unknowingly drinking breast milk from a bottle in the refrigerator—that the movie is “one of the most unapologetically Jewish blockbusters of all time.”

Forward suggested that *Meet the Fockers* was a reflection—a celebration—of the reality of Jewish cultural life in America. Hardly an endorsement, one would think, that the Jewish people would want.

And—quite pointedly and revealingly—an Orthodox Jewish Rabbi, Simcha Weinstein, told the Jewish magazine, *Moment* (in its November/December 2010) issue, that this vulgar film exemplified, in his words, how “Jews have become more American and America has become more Jewish.” Hardly an endorsement, one would think, that the American people would want.

And speaking of toilet “humor,” I must be honest in saying that it’s probably no coincidence that, over the years, when I’ve received emails from people upset about my opposition to Israel that the messages—which usually are posed in a scoffing, sarcastic, belittling tone—most always contain allusions to bodily functions in one form or another. I do not exaggerate. In fact, not once, but twice—and I kid you not—Jewish critics have even made references to dirty diapers, the presumptive “humor” being in the fact, as the writers made clear, that my last name happens to rhyme with diaper. Juvenile, to be sure, but a sad reflection on the peculiar mindset of my Jewish critics.

In fact, until I started receiving these type of emails from Jewish folks, the last time I heard my name rhymed in conjunction with the word diaper was in the first grade when someone loudly declared that “Michael Piper wears a diaper.”

And just for the record, I’m not the only person who has detected this type of bizarre toilet-focused rhetoric coming from Jews distressed at criticism of Israel. My friend and colleague Mark Glenn has noted precisely the same trend in emails from his Jewish critics.

And don’t forget, as I pointed out earlier in these pages, an eminent Jewish psychiatrist “discovered” that anti-Semites got that way because of troubles in toilet training.

So—well, what more can I say? There’s something there, for want of a better way of putting it. But I will not try to analyze or explain. I simply relate all of this as a matter of fact.

And it is a matter of fact, not a matter of opinion.

Jews are different and they do think differently. They do believe their mindset is superior, that their ways are superior, and that—precisely because of that—they are destined to (and deserve to) rule the world.

A. N. Wilson, one of the most respected of modern-day English writers—a much-quoted literary figure whose work has delved into everything from history to biography to fiction—put things in perspective when he pointed out:

We all know the Jews regard themselves as a separate group within society. And yet there remains something unacceptable about Gentiles sharing the view Jews take of themselves.

Jewish arrogance is displayed in many ways in our culture, sometimes in subtle ways that perhaps even the Jews do not recognize, so wrapped up they are in their own self-worship and self-promotion.

Note this, for example: some years ago *Time* magazine featured a brief item proudly proclaiming that words from Yiddish—a Jewish language once correctly described as “the vernacular of the international underworld”—had begun to permeate American national culture.

Yet not once did the great magazine ever advise its readers exactly what Yiddish was or even trace for the readers the historical (and particularly Jewish) origins of this colorful tongue.

Now one might suggest that the magazine did not need to define the word because “everybody knows what Yiddish is,” but the fact is that, generally, in a story such as this, *Time* would have briefly explained just exactly what Yiddish was, if only by a brief sentence to do so.

The significance of this is that the article was clearly aimed at Jewish readers for their own self-celebratory purposes and *Time* didn’t consider its Gentile readers worth the trouble to explain it to them.

It was an article by Jews for Jews in the pages of a national and ostensibly “popular” and “nonsecular” magazine and it was clearly published as such, a proverbial “wink and nod” to the Jews from the Jewish owners and editors of *Time*, essentially saying, “We are everywhere and even our language is reshaping American popular culture.”

Some may suggest I am making too much of a simple thing, but I don’t believe that I am. I present that story as a reflection of the nature of the arrogant attitude that the organized Jewish world holds toward all others. In truth, the Jewish arrogance has been part and parcel, front and center, of the Jewish troubles of the past, a primary stimulus for anti-Semitism on the part of so many different peoples throughout history.

So while this seeming digression into the matter of Jewish Humor

(and note that I capitalize both words) may have initially appeared to be just that—a digression—in the bigger picture that we have been exploring in these pages, it really does mean so very much.

It is indeed the Jewish outlook toward “The Other” that has framed our world today—whether we like it or not. The Jewish Agenda is the driving force behind so much of the problems that plague us today or which have otherwise plagued the planet in the past.

Many authors have explored the Jewish origins of Communism and have detailed the wicked ways of the early Bolsheviks. Such authors have been routinely dubbed “anti-Semitic propagandists.”

Yet there are even concerted efforts by Jews today to suggest that even the early Bolsheviks were somehow “anti-Semitic,” a theme popping up in articles in Jewish newspapers and journals—all written with a straight face—and in the works of American “conservative” authors: The Jews are seeking to insinuate themselves into the modern-day mode of “conservatism” (in all of its manifestations) and the self-styled “conservatives” are pandering to the Jews by ignoring the Jewish predominance in Bolshevism and parroting the Jewish claim that “the Jews were victims of the communists, too”—a shameful, incestuous circle of nonsense that the perpetrators surely don’t even believe themselves. But say it they do!

There was even the institution, in Washington, DC, of a certainly justified memorial to the victims of communism. However, what many contributors to the project didn’t know was that the originators of the project had bragged to the Jewish press that the primary theme of the memorial’s agenda was to honor the *Jewish* victims of communism. Evidently the Gentile victims of communism—some 50 to 100 million (the estimates vary) were just along for the ride.

In his *Autobiography*, no less than the titanic Welsh-born British Nobel Prize winner and peace advocate, Bertrand Russell, candidly described Bolshevism and its Judaic centrality:

Bolshevism is a close, tyrannical bureaucracy, with a spy system more elaborate and terrible than the Tsar’s, and an aristocracy as insolent and unfeeling, composed of Americanized Jews.

Russell—an adamant opponent of Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany—can hardly be called an “anti-Semite.”

But his estimation of the nature of Bolshevism is probably about the most profound and most succinct summary of its very nature ever committed to print. And Russell’s remarks are additionally noteworthy, beyond question, in that Russell pointed out that there were indeed many “Americanized Jews” in the forefront of the Bolshevik regime.

And Zionism—another Jewish project along with Bolshevism—has certainly made its presence felt, reflecting again the Jewish outlook toward the Gentile world, imposing the Jewish Agenda upon “The Other.”

We often hear of the complaints of the Christian and Muslim peoples of Palestine regarding the impact of Zionism upon their existence. But let us not kid ourselves. The concerns about Zionist brutality go well beyond that of the victims. Good people all over the world have been standing up to say “Enough!” to the Jewish oppressors of Occupied Palestine.

Even such a hardened, battle-tested military man as General Sir Evelyn Barker, general commanding officer of the British forces in Palestine from 1946-1947, was astounded by the relentless Jewish barbarism he witnessed among the Zionist terrorists in the region.

Following the bombing by the Jews of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem on July 22, 1946—when nearly one hundred were killed and another 50 were wounded, including, by the way, a number of Jews among the victims—the general wrote:

These bloody Jews. Yes, I loathe the lot—whether they be Zionists or not. Why should we be afraid of saying we hate them—it’s time this damned race knew what we think of them—loathsome people.

And in the wake of the 1948 mass slaughter by the Jewish terrorists of some 120 Arabs in the little village of Deir Yassin—many of them women and children—Sir John Troutbeck of the British Middle East Office in Cairo reflected that massacre was “a warning of what the Jew will do to gain his purpose.”

Later, Sir John said (quite correctly) that the United States had been responsible for the creation of a gangster state that, he said, was run by “an utterly unscrupulous set of leaders.”

What Sir John said in 1948 was so very much on the mark. The events at Deir Yassin—a prolonged affair of an insidious almost ritual-like nature that took place over several days—were a warning of what the Jew will do to gain his purpose.

And that state of Israel—brought into being with the connivance of a U.S. government under the sway of Jewish influence—remains a gangster state to this day, dominated by utterly unscrupulous leaders.

But the big difference is that now Israel reigns among the most powerful nations on the planet, armed with nuclear weapons—a dangerous arsenal the Jewish fanatics vow will be used to prevent “another Holocaust.” And their “Holocaust” is central to the propaganda that the international Jewish Agenda continues to perpetrate upon all others—

the constant knashing and screeching and snarling that reverberates in our ears and burrows into the minds and souls of so many non-Jews who have become hypnotized with this rhetoric used to push us toward the Jewish Utopia—the New World Order. And it never seems to stop.

It has indeed become very much a ritual—in the classic religious sense—wherein non-Jews pay homage to the Jews (and their would-be New World Order) by expressing endless regrets and apologies for the events known as “The Holocaust.”

On January 25, 2011, Guillaume Pepy, chairman of the SNCF, the French national railway, splayed himself on the altar of “The Holocaust” when he publicly apologized for—of all things—the fact that the French railway had been used to transport Jews during World War II. He cried out—almost as if a condemned man begging for mercy from the dictator: “I bow down before the victims, the survivors, the children of those deported, and before the suffering that still lives.”

I ask, in all seriousness:

What comes next?

Will the manufacturer of the railroad cars that transported those Jews be forced to pay reparations to the Jews for having dared to supply the French railway company with those cars, knowing that the Jews were being deported?

(Why, after all, shouldn’t they have objected? Wasn’t that the moral thing to do, the Jews will say.)

Will the garment makers who stitched together the uniforms of the railroad crews of those now-infamous trains be forced to apologize for their “part” in “The Holocaust”?

(Those garment makers knew they were making those train crews warm and comfortable, even as the trainmen delivered the poor persecuted Jews, freezing in boxcars, to their deaths.)

Will the now-aged (if still living) former engineers who steered those trains be called up on war crimes charges?

(After all, weren’t they willing participants? Could they not have steered those Jews to safety—away from “the death camps”?)

This is the kind of thinking that pervades today. And the tragedy is that the Gentile world has allowed itself to be bamboozled—no, make that “bullied”—into this worshipful mindset toward the Jews. And yes, it is “the Jews”—not just “the Zionists”—we are talking about here.

This yackety-yak, clickety-clack about “The Holocaust”—It just simply never ends. And that is precisely what the New World Order forces want. They are determined to keep “Hitler and the Nazis” and “The Holocaust” before us in all ways possible. It’s integral—the underscoring linguistic foundation—to the Big Plan to usher in the Jewish Utopia.

As recently as February 11, 2011, Susan Levy—the mother of martyred American Jewish Princess Chandra Levy who was famously murdered in Rock Creek Park in Washington, DC in 2001, generating a national media frenzy—managed to inject “The Holocaust” into the public arena during the sentencing of a Salvadoran immigrant who had just been convicted (whether rightly or wrongly) of Chandra’s slaying.

Addressing the alleged murderer during the court hearing, Mrs. Levy shrieked, “Because of you, young man, you have caused us to live a Holocaust again,” shortly before she eloquently ended her testimony with the abrupt suggestion in Talmudic-style language: “Fuck you.”

While we can certainly sympathize with Mrs. Levy’s suffering—and that of her husband, said to be a “Holocaust survivor”—at the loss of her daughter, we cannot but help wonder about the appropriateness of “The Holocaust” being made a part of the Chandra Levy Legend.

But Mrs. Levy—like so many millions of Jews—has become enamored, indoctrinated, enthralled with the tales of the Holocaust and she evidenced no shame in introducing the matter, despite the fact that a non-Jew—flamboyantly exploiting Holocaust imagery for her own purposes in what was, in reality, a trivial matter in the bigger world picture—would have been roundly condemned.

However, of course, since Mrs. Levy is a Jew and obviously a woman who had been inflicted with great personal suffering, nobody dared point out the outrageous nature of her comments: the effective elevation of this disturbed young man, with a history of violence toward women, to the status of Adolf Hitler himself through the endless rhetorical flourishing of “The Holocaust” that Mrs. Levy used for her own purposes.

“The Holocaust” is always with us and it is very much a part of the drive for the New World Order.

We’ve heard all we need to hear from the Holocaust promoters, and we know what they have to say. Their message is so pervading, so ever-present—in books, newspapers, television, and radio—that it has been virtually impossible to escape “The Holocaust” in American life.

For my own part, I don’t care whether a handful of people are outraged that I don’t share their agony about the events of “The Holocaust”—because I don’t. And I won’t be extorted into saying that I do, simply to avoid being labeled as “Holocaust denier.” I bear no guilt. I bear no shame. Let it be said: “I’m tired of hearing about The Holocaust.”

As an American of American Indian heritage—one whose forebears suffered a real Holocaust and whose own ethnic kin continue to suffer today in concentration camps known as “reservations”—I find it hard to sympathize with Jews who, while railing about World War II, now constitute the most powerful group on the face of the entire planet today.

For me, there are no restless nights worrying about the Six Million or the Seven Million or the Forty Million, whatever the current “favorite” number of Holocaust victims happens to be.

The Holocaust is over. Enough.

Yet, here we are . . .

We now stand facing a future that could be quite ugly—a world in which, as we’ve said repeatedly, there may well be a real Holocaust—a global nuclear conflict touched off by Israel, particularly over the issue of Iran’s reputed drive to achieve nuclear weapons to compete with those of Zionist Israel. Israel demands supremacy in the Middle East and around the world and has been using my nation as its tool to achieve that end.

In that regard, in the midst of his campaign to promote wars of aggression against all nations that were real, perceived or potential enemies of Israel—and, by extension, the United States, as Israel’s chief defender on the global stage—President George W. Bush insinuated the phrase “axis of evil” into the international lexicon.

The choice of the term “axis” (as used by Bush) was dreamed up by Bush speech writer David Frum, a Canadian-born Jewish pro-Israel advocate of long standing and a key figure in the warmongering “neo-conservative” Zionist network that came to power in the Bush era of shame.

The adoption of this terminology by a skilled Zionist propagandist and then fed to the U.S. president for regurgitation was deliberate and contrived since it cleverly recalled the old image of the evil “Axis Powers” of World War II, comprising Germany, Japan and Italy.

After all, the Axis Powers long exemplified evil in the minds of most Americans whose news diets are supplemented with daily reminders of Axis infamy, including the ever-present “Holocaust.”

In fact, the effort to compare critics of U.S. favoritism for Israel—an ever-growing class of nations and people worldwide—to America’s World War II enemies is integral to the propaganda campaign to paint Israel’s foes as a modern incarnation of the old Axis powers. The Jewish-controlled media stokes up fears of the rise of what it calls “Islamofascism.”

The threat of “the Axis of Evil” is said to remain in force, and Americans are urged to put an end to this purported danger. We are warned of “new Hitlers,” such as the late Saddam Hussein, and, more recently, Iranian President Ahmadinejad, not to mention Hugo Chavez of Venezuela and Vladimir Putin of Russia, among others.

In the face of this, meeting in Tokyo in 2006, outspoken nationalists from two of the so-called “Axis Powers” of World War II—Japan and Germany—revived the concept of an “axis” and called it the “Axis of Survival.” They turned the tables on the Zionist warlords, appropriating the term “axis” and used it in a positive, forward-looking sense.

Veteran German patriot Manfred Roeder and his Japanese counterpart Ryu Ohta, chairman of the Society for the Critique of Contemporary Civilization—my dear friend who hosted me in Japan in 2004—hammered out the "Manifesto of the Axis of Survival" and signed it before witnesses who endorsed the spirit of the document.

A candid and forthright challenge to the internationalism of those Jewish schemers and their henchmen who advocate war and imperialism while hiding their evil motivation behind expressions of freedom and democracy, it is a rhetorical exposition of the growing nationalism—and opposition to the New World Order—all across the planet.

American Free Press was pleased to publish a rendition of the manifesto and in memory of Dr. Ohta, I am proud to republish here it again for a permanent record in the pages of this very personal volume.

The words of this carefully-drafted document reflect my own thinking about mankind's plight today, words that people everywhere need to review with due diligence. It represents a singularly important expression of true nationalism and sums up what needs to be addressed if the world is to avert yet another Jewish war of survival. The manifesto reads:

MANIFESTO OF THE AXIS OF SURVIVAL

Oswald Spengler once wrote *The Decline of the West*.

If there ever was a Western civilization it was destroyed in two World Wars by the Western Powers—England and the United States of America—directed by Jewish forces in the background. There is no more a civilization of Western values.

World War II was not only directed against European values but it was also meant to subvert all basic values of East and West. Therefore it was also a way of destruction against Japan as fortress of basic Eastern values.

Representatives of Japan and Germany have joined in the same conviction: that if the world is meant to survive, a totally new path must be shown.

These are the facts:

- Britain, the United States and Israel are the forces against the rest of the world, determined to dominate and exploit all nations.

- In Nuremberg and Tokyo they have demonstrated by manipulated mock trials that they are not satisfied by mere military victory but are determined to declare any man or nation as evil and criminal who are standing in their way of world power.

- They have brutally killed and demonized the elected lead-

ers of Germany and Japan. They have killed millions after the war and hanged the heroes of vanquished nations.

- There can be no "New World Order" under their dominance, like the United Nations, NATO or any other international organizations in which they are giving the rules. This is not acceptable for other nations, because Britain, the United States and Israel are committing—up to this day—all the crimes they are accusing others of committing.

We solemnly declare:

- There should be no world order under the leadership of one. There is no common culture for all the nations;

- Profit can never be the basis of culture;

- Belief in technical progress as the essence of life will destroy all culture and human dignity. It turns humans into soulless machines;

- Every nation has its own roots and cultural and religious heritage, and it should maintain and preserve them. Every nation has a different tradition and spiritual roots; every nation should have her own system of government;

- Every nation needs an elite of leadership—but not necessarily political parties;

- Not so-called progress, but historical roots, basic values and hence heritage is needed for mankind.

Japan and Germany were comrades in arms, and suffered the same fate and destruction. We feel a common commitment to show a better way for the future:

- No domination by Britain, the United States or Israel;

- Join us to build a world of truly independent nations;

- Stop devastating nature for profit;

- Stop global financial multinational corporate power from taking over;

- We need cooperation [not] domination and exploitation.

Help us to prevent global suicide.

And strengthen our Axis for Survival, before it is too late.

Signed in Tokyo, November 9, 2006

RYU OHTA, Tokyo, Japan

MANFRED ROEDER, Schwarzenborn, Germany

Thus two representatives of two nations—Germany and Japan—that paid a mighty price (as did so many millions of other peoples in other nations) joined together to issue a clarion call that the people of the 21st Century must follow. It is as simple as that.

I can think of no better expression of such an important message, particularly as we proceed into this 21st Century that could—if trends are not redirected—see the destruction of mankind.

In that regard, it's probably appropriate to conclude by noting that on January 26, 2011, the distinguished Jewish newspaper, *Forward*, published a remarkable story which began with these words: "In the 20th century, Jews created bombs. Weapons of mass destruction."

Reviewing the life of Samuel Cohen, creator of the neutron bomb—said by Cohen to be a "moral bomb" because it only killed people and didn't destroy valuable infrastructure—*Forward* noted that an expert had averred that, in *Forward's* words, "the question of why Jews were so drawn to this work does not have a simple answer," but when all was said and done, Cohen himself "saw how the Jewish identity of his fellow scientists also influenced their work."

And while Cohen was an avowed atheist (like many Jews, if truth be told!), his daughter said that he was proud of being a Jew and, according to *Forward*, "even had a kind of 'arrogant attitude' about Jewish intelligence." Cohen once wrote: "I'm a lousy Jew, but beneath the surface I'm really Jewish. I can't help it."

So Cohen's simple words probably summarize a point that we have—with all understanding—noted repeatedly in this volume:

The Jews just can't help it.

They just can't help being Jews.

And they do have this "arrogant attitude" that shapes their world view—one of Jewish superiority.

That is *their* problem, but it is also *ours*: the world at large.

The dangerous mindset of these people who raised up The Jewish Hell Bomb is very much with us today.

If anything, the Jewish Presence on planet Earth is perhaps best represented in no uncertain terms by the reality of The Jewish Hell Bomb.

And the question remains: Must the world fight yet another Jewish War of Survival, one in which Jewish-inspired technology of mass destruction could result in there being *no survivors at all*?

SOME FINAL THOUGHTS . . .

We Must ALL Dare to Speak Out: Facing "The Caiaphas Complex" and Resolving the Problem of Anti-Semitism Is Most Assuredly the Key to Global Peace

One time, not long ago, I had occasion to be riding in a taxi in Washington, DC and in the course of that journey I became engaged in a conversation with the driver—a man of African origin—about the extraordinary Jewish Presence in American affairs (and consequently those of the world itself).

In the midst of that discussion, the driver himself brought up Israel's infamous—although not as infamous as it should be—attack on the *U.S.S. Liberty* and the resulting murder of 34 American servicemen and the maiming of 172 others.

And you can imagine how pleased I was that this African—unlike, sadly, most Americans—was aware of this incident. But what was so interesting was that this gentleman understood the far greater geopolitical ramifications of this crime and the manner in which it was treated (or not treated, as the case may be) by the so-called "American" government.

In any event, just as the driver was nearing my stop, he picked up another passenger, a young man in his 20s, whom I was immediately certain, by his way of speaking and by his appearance, was Jewish.

However, the driver and I continued our discussion and, at one point, I made several factual statements regarding my own knowledge surrounding the events of the *Liberty* affair.

At that juncture, the Jewish lad who had joined us jumped into the conversation and quite vehemently asserted, in almost hysterical tones: "Driver, pay no attention to what this man is saying. Nothing he is saying is true. None of this is true."

I said nothing. I did not need to, for the driver turned to the Jewish youth and said, "Oh no, everything this man has said is true. I know all about this matter myself. He is absolutely right."

The Jewish advocate for Jewish terrorism sank back in his seat, muttering darkly about something or another, but I was most satisfied that someone—in this case, the driver (who was risking a tip, to be sure)—had indeed dared to speak out in no uncertain terms, silencing the attempted bullying by his Jewish passenger.

But what is most telling about this story—if you haven't figured it out for yourself—is that this young man truly seemed to believe that if he continued to insist loudly and with passion that Israel's attack on the *Liberty* was an "accident"—and that there were no evil motives behind it—that this would effectively erase the truth, banish facts to the histori-

cal dustbin, and thereby excuse Israel and the Jewish people (as a group) from the responsibility for this outrageous act of war against its ally and the good men of the *Liberty*.

And this all comes back to the fact—as we pointed out earlier—that heralded Jewish barrister, Anthony Julius, has asserted that “all anti-Semitic accounts of Jews are fictional in the received sense of being false.” That anything that reflects badly upon Jews is just simply a lie. And that is what this young Jewish man was indeed saying.

Another incident along these lines is also instructive. Not long afterward, while I was again traveling by taxi in Washington, DC, I was engaged in a similar conversation with the driver—another African—and we happened to stop to pick up a young lady on Capitol Hill, probably a congressional staff member on her way home.

Our give-and-take continued in a lively fashion, touching upon various sordid aspects of the U.S.-Israel “special relationship,”—including, once again, the attack on the *Liberty*—but the young lady did not join us in the discussion. Instead, she energetically and with a flourish pulled out her cell phone and—in a deliberately quite vocal tone—called a friend and advised him as follows: “I’m in a cab right now. I’m almost home. But I am listening to the most horrible garbage being spewed.”

The operative word here is “spewed.” This is an over-used term, used in an fervently ubiquitous fashion, by the Jews (and I do mean “the Jews” in particular) to maliciously and graphically deprecate anything perhaps even slightly critical of the Jewish Agenda.

I don’t think the lady was Jewish. In fact, it doesn’t matter if she was. The point here is that she knew precisely what term to use to denounce the conversation that she was hearing.

The Jewish Presence in the American mindset—a direct consequence of the mind-altering clamor of the Jewish-controlled media—is such that this lady used the term almost as if by rote. She had clearly been (most likely unwittingly) indoctrinated, schooled—call it “brain-washed”—in Jewish linguistics: the legerdemain of the New World Order. But trained she was—and trained well.

And it’s worth pointing out that the term “spewed” is—once again—a turn-of-phrase referring to a bodily function. This bizarre usage, as we have seen, is all too prevalent and typical in the Jewish grammar vis-a-vis addressing their critics and perceived foes, ranging all the way back to the assertion by a famed Jewish psychiatrist that “anti-Semitism” can be traced to problems in toilet training by those accused of that crime.

Urination. Defecation. Vomit.

The young lady in that taxi would have us believe—as do the Jews—that anything critical of the Jews and their behavior—even the slaughter

of the Americans aboard the *Liberty*—is nothing more than “garbage (the facts of history notwithstanding) and that anyone who discusses such matters is delving into some form of human waste. How sick.

Can there really be any wonder, in the end, why there is such a thing as anti-Semitism and why it is as rampant (or so the Jews tell us) as it is? It is this kind of thinking on the part of the Jews—shaped by the filth and bile of the Talmud—that has stimulated anti-Semitism.

I cannot help but recall one more incident that reflects upon the Jewish insistence upon denying facts and refusing to debate those who dare to raise facts that rain on their parade.

This took place in the summer of 1998, when I was in Orange County, California to address a meeting of the board of trustees of Saddleback College where the Jews—through a loud and angry campaign of threatening phone calls and other means of bullying—forced cancellation of a forum at that school where I was scheduled to speak on the topic of my book *Final Judgment*.

The matter became so raucous that, at one point, the affair was featured in a front page story in *The Los Angeles Times* on August 21, 1997. But undaunted, I still traveled to Orange County to confront the Jews head on in the halls of academia, intending to speak publicly before the college trustees (rather than before the students as originally intended) and challenge the Jewish Thought Police as the criminals that they were.

It was here—as I noted in the opening pages of this book—that I was threatened by the Neanderthal, Irv Rubin, of the terrorist Jewish Defense League, which is secretly supported by “respectable” Jewish leaders such as the Anti-Defamation League, not to mention their foreign principals in Israel’s intelligence service, the Mossad.

There was much interest in the fact that I was going to appear there at the college, not in small part due to the fact that I had invited readers of *The Spotlight* newspaper to come in my support, and along with the police and the Jewish Defense League and crowds of gawkers—sympathetic to me and otherwise—there came the media.

As I waited outside, prior to the meeting of the trustees, an idealistic young reporter for a local Jewish community newspaper approached me and made energetic efforts to pin me down as a “Holocaust Denier” and as an “anti-Semite” and to challenge the basic thesis of my book.

However, as I spoke to yet another reporter on the scene, I overheard Bob Ourlian, a reporter for *The Los Angeles Times*, whisper to the young lady from the Jewish newspaper, saying in an urgent tone: “Don’t try to argue with this guy. He’s very articulate and knows what he’s talking about.” On a dime, the Jewish reporter quickly changed her approach, now addressing me with sweetness and light and sugar and honey.

I was flattered by Ourlian's (unintended) compliments, but I was struck by the fact that (as per usual) the official Jewish approach—refusing to debate critics of the Jewish Agenda—was once again in play.

They are cowards, to be sure, but they are cowards who use all manner of lies, bullying and double standards—and violence—to enforce their claim upon the course of mankind's future. And it is no surprise that what is called "anti-Semitism" has been found even in the minds of our greatest thinkers of all ages and tribes. Intellectuals, above all, reject the barbarian ape-man approach of the Jews to their critics.

In many respects, really, it can be said that the Jews are (and always have been) the foremost force warring against liberty of thought, against free inquiry, against the right to speak out and speak clearly about the issues that face mankind. They cannot operate in a climate of honesty and openness, so therefore they damn and seek to destroy their critics by all means possible. And more than a few have noted this.

One of the foremost liberal intellectuals of the 19th century was Goldwin Smith, an Englishman, who was professor of modern history at Oxford and of English and constitutional history at Cornell University. In 1906 he was described by one journal as "the leading and almost the only exponent of anti-Semitism in the English-speaking world."

Smith spoke of Jewish "tribal arrogance," rejected their claim of being "chosen," and took umbrage at the Jewish view of Gentiles as being "unclean." He had no problem with being called "anti-Semitic"—he said—if that term mean "fear of political, social and financial influence" on the part of the Jews. Smith explained what cemented Jewish power:

These Jews hang together. There is a tacit understanding amongst them. A real danger lurks beneath their efforts. I don't like to say too much on this subject. I don't like to appear to be ventilating a craze; but that it is a fact, I am convinced . . .

Note Smith's words: "A real danger lurks beneath their efforts." So it was in Smith's day. So it is today.

And no less than that great critic of totalitarianism, George Orwell, was once smeared as being "at heart strongly anti-Semitic." For his own part Orwell said that there should be "a full inquiry into the prevalence of anti-Semitism," and that "the fact that we should probably find that anti-Semitism of various kinds is alarmingly common, and that educated people are not the least immune from it, ought not to deter us."

Likewise, R. I. Moore, an influential modern historian of the medieval period, has argued in his book, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe* (published by Blackwell in

1987) that the expansion of the power and influence of the literate class was a key factor in the rise of anti-Semitism in the Middle Ages, laying to waste the perpetual Jewish claim that only un-educated, illiterate country bumpkins, trailer park trash, and the proverbial bigots, cranks and hoodlums are guilty of this most heinous of outrages against humanity.

Perhaps in light of the never-ending linguistic war against the world in the name of "fighting anti-Semitism" we should recall the widely-traveled and deeply-respected American businessman, diplomat and philanthropist Charles R. Crane (who lived from 1858 to 1939).

A valued friend of the Arab world and an unabashed admirer of its contributions to humanity (which the Jews seek today to deny) Crane was also a forthright anti-communist who dared—at a time when few would have done so—to openly praise Joseph Stalin for the Russian leader's efforts to purge Russia of Jewish influence. Crane was lambasted by the Jews as an "anti-Semite," but Crane said, with candor, that he considered that to be a "title of honor."

Those of us today who seek to restore some sense of honor to the world can perhaps take Crane's words to heart, for—as we have seen—virtually everyone of substance throughout the history of mankind has been tarred, in one way or another, as an "anti-Semite."

Napoleon said that "history is a set of lies agreed upon," and the official history of mankind—as the Jews would dictate it—is that the Jews have suffered—victims of madness, greed, hatred, jealousy, and from the problems of Gentiles in toilet training—and that they have been entirely innocent of misdeed. It is only the Jewish version of history that counts.

Recognizing as did Napoleon that all is not quite what we have been told by our respected "historians," George Bernard Shaw, the great Irish dramatist and social commentator—like Napoleon, another suspected "anti-Semite"—said that "No one has satisfactorily placed a boundary between myth and history."

And he was right.

Much of what we believe to be "history" insofar as the problem of anti-Semitism is concerned is actually—in all truth—myth. Some would go so far as to say—and not necessarily incorrectly—that much of history is rather a very expansive tissue of lies, carefully crafted falsehoods presented in cleverly-drawn rhetoric that today focuses all-too-often on "Hitler and the Nazis" and "The Holocaust" and . . . "anti-Semitism."

This problem we call anti-Semitism is not about to go away any time soon—and it's almost certainly going to get worse.

As I look back over the years and my efforts to resolve this conflict of the ages, I sometimes marvel at the very fact I was even bold enough in the first place to have dared to wade into this parasite-infested swamp.

Would I do it all over again?

Yes—believe it or not—I would.

The reason why I would do it all over again is that I came to the conclusion, long ago, that I was doing the right thing.

I confess there have been a few times that I have frankly asked myself if I was somehow wrong, that perhaps I was in error, criticizing Jewish people for their misuse of their vast influence on global affairs.

But sitting back, pondering the matter, I started weighing precisely what the Jews (as a group) were doing against my own simple efforts—writing and speaking—and I realized that, on the scales of reality, the scales of history, what I was doing was, in fact, a good thing: trying to provide balance, attempting to give the public the proverbial “other side of the story,” and to give them the opportunity to freely make choices about their world’s future.

I have never provoked wars, revolutions, inflations and depressions. I have not looted countries. I have not divided peoples and nations. Quite the contrary, I’ve been commenting upon and exposing those who have done these treacherous things.

And I have seen the rise of the Zionist police state here in America, a construct ostensibly aimed at “fighting terrorism,” but, in reality, yet another advance in the Jewish Agenda toward totalitarian control. And it is not only here in America. Mechanisms of Jewish tyranny are in place throughout the “civilized” West.

I recall my last visit to Canada, under the sponsorship of my friend Paul Fromm, director of the Canadian Association for Free Expression, and how, when entering Canada—that beautiful country my family and I visited regularly during my childhood—I was steered off to a special inquiry by a customs officer.

There on the computer screen—as she quizzed me about my reasons for visiting Canada—I could see a very detailed dossier on my personal history and political associations. And if my record is on even Canadian “homeland security” files, you can rest assured that it is on similar files internationally. And that is frightening.

It is also frightening—and that’s putting it mildly—to learn that the second biggest bank in Israel, Bank Leumi—owned in part by the government of Israel itself—held a controlling interest in one of the big “American” corporations that reap vast profits by operating private prisons in the United States where thousands of Americans work at slave-labor wages while serving out their penal terms. This came even while Israel was outlawing private prisons on its own soil.

I only discovered this little-known fact—which should be a national scandal—because it was mentioned in passing in an article in the Jewish-

published New York-based Heeb magazine. However, after I subsequently then turned (for further data) to the Internet where, it is said, “you can find everything,” I found that this explosive information was otherwise carefully ignored or suppressed.

Although I’m quite skilled—if truth be told—in Internet research, and engaged in at least six hours over several days of seeking some confirmation of this same data, I could not find it, even on liberal websites devoted to exposing the private prison industry in no uncertain terms.

And when I sent emails to multiple individuals who had written extensively on the subject of private prisons in America, asking for any information they had in regard to the matter, I received only one response—and a tepid one at that—never directly addressing the subject at hand. Obviously, the “Israeli connection” was just “too hot to handle” and the bold activists who readily challenge the U.S. government and its law enforcement system over the issue of private prisons had nothing—repeat: NOTHING—to say about the fact of Israeli profiteering at the expense of America’s prison population.

I can assure you with no doubt whatsoever that if it were learned that any foreign nation—with the exception of Israel—held a major interest in one of the major American private prison enterprises, that it would be the subject of discussion on “Sixty Minutes,” the focus of at least one independent documentary, bandied about in angry editorials, and generally the subject of great concern.

In addition, although liberal activists over the years took much delight in savaging former conservative Republican Vice President Dan Quayle, none of the many opponents of the private prison industries in America jumped on the fact that Quayle, in fact, was (as we noted earlier) chairman of the board of the Cerberus Global Investments, the New York-based holding company which, in 2008, purchased the Israeli government’s interest in Bank Leumi, the Israeli bank that held the controlling interest in the “American” company operating private prisons in America. Evidently that is one of Quayle’s ventures that is just fine and dandy—or, at the least, not to be criticized or even mentioned!

However, because dear little Israel is once again at the center of activity that is questionable (at least in the minds of many good people) the truth remains ignored or suppressed.

And the fact that Israelis were now essentially in charge of maintaining a substantial control over America’s penal system—and of a growing number of penal systems throughout the world where Israeli-owned companies are aggressively engaged in setting up private prison systems—is another reason why I believe the deconstruction of the global Jewish would-be-New World Order is a priority of the first order.

And is it wrong of me to be concerned about the fact that—in the midst of the now-infamous Jack Abramoff corruption scandal on Capitol Hill—it was learned that one of the Republican congressmen caught up in the affair, Bob Ney of Ohio, had awarded a telecommunications contract to an Israeli company, giving it control over all cell phone communications emanating from the U.S. Capitol and its environs?

And is it wrong of me to be concerned about the fact that Magal, an Israeli company (also owned in part by the government of Israel) is in charge of “security” for the most sensitive nuclear power and weapons storage facilities on American soil? (This is another of those unpleasant, little-known facts that I documented in my book, *The Golem*.)

What has happened to American security and sovereignty? Is the Jewish state now officially charged with these responsibilities?

If opposing this kind of Orwellian Big Brother Soviet-style surveillance (and control) is perceived to be “anti-Semitic”—and that is how some view my concerns—*then let me say in no uncertain terms that I am anti-Semitic.*

Reviewing the big names—prestigious folks—throughout history who have shared my concerns, I see that I’ve been in some mightily impressive company. They, too, have been called “anti-Semites.”

Over the years I have been warned by some otherwise supportive people—friends, acquaintances, teachers, etc.—that it would not serve me well to tangle with the Jews. “They’re very powerful. They’ll try to destroy you,” said more than a few of those counselors, perhaps not realizing that, in a most profound sense, they were actually confirming that all of my concerns and criticisms of the Jews were on the mark. The very fact that they were warning me about the Jews—as a group—was an implicit admission that I was, in fact, correct all along!

I recall one of my favorite teachers. Let’s call her “Ginny.” Extravagantly good-looking, witty, well-read, quite worldly, she was a classic model of the outspoken “I am Woman, Hear Me Roar” of the 70s style. Unabashedly liberal and an unswerving advocate of free thought, a genuine intellectual of the best sort, Ginny definitely broke the mold of the rural community in which we had both been raised. And she encouraged me (with great relish, I should say) in my writing and rhetorical bombast. In some respects, she was very much a mentor to me, both intellectually and professionally.

However, when I finally went all the way, so to speak—exercising freedom of thought in a—no, “the”—most controversial arena, speaking out about the dangers of Jewish power, daring to challenge the official modes of “right and wrong” regarding history and current affairs vis-a-vis the matter of Jewish and Zionist intrigues—she was absolutely resolute

in her opposition. Her liberalism, her advocacy of free thought, her long-cherished tradition of cheering on those who took on “the Establishment” went right out the door, down the drain, out with the garbage, into the dustbin. Ginny encouraged me to think and to speak out and I did so, even if it wasn’t in quite the direction she hoped.

When it came to the issue of the Jewish Agenda, Ginny was no longer the vibrant, roaring “Liberal Lioness.” And I (perhaps) understand why. In the early 1980s—when I first entered in a big way into public debate over such topics—it was still quite fashionable in liberal circles to worship at the altar of Israel, that “scrapping little democracy whose people survived the Nazi Beast and rose from the ashes of the Holocaust.”

And yet, despite her distinctly “anti-liberal” stance vis-a-vis freedom of expression regarding the Jewish Agenda, Ginny fervently identified support for Israel with “the liberal agenda” and perceived opposition to the Jewish state to exemplify “the conservative agenda.” (In those days, many readers will recall, liberals went “whole hog” in trumpeting Israel. Most “conservatives,” in contrast, simply said nothing.)

Like many of her generation, Ginny was caught up in the old-fashioned “left-right” paradigm (phony from the start) that we now see so clearly inhibited intellectual freedom throughout the 20th Century.

However—and this is most interesting—the rise of the great “conservative” heyday under George W. Bush and the consequent Jewish wars of conquest in the Middle East (carried out under the banner of the Stars & Stripes) put many American liberals in quite a quandary. Those fervent critics of U.S. involvement in Vietnam were suddenly faced with some difficult decisions:

- Should they support Zionist imperialism (wrapped in the American flag) or should they be true to their past stated opposition to U.S. adventurism and military meddling abroad?

- Were they going to stand beside that icon of “conservatism,” George W. Bush—and his Jewish allies and the state of Israel—or were they going to rally on behalf of the Christians and Muslims of the Middle East, folks from the “Third World” who (in other countries, anyway) had always been of great concern to American liberals?

- Were these self-styled “free thinkers” going to align themselves with the likes of such narrow-minded Zionist fanatics as Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson and Tim LaHaye (to name but a few of Jewry’s chief advocates among the so-called Christian Right) or were they going to stand with so many millions of people worldwide—people of all faiths, with the notable exception of Judaism—who rejected the American Crusade, the latest of all-too-many Jewish Wars of Survival conducted at the expense of American blood and treasure?

There's no question about it: The rise of Trotskyite Jewish Communism in America, under the guise of "neo-conservatism"—truly a catchphrase that can just as easily be called "Global Zionism" (which is precisely what it is)—set forth a whole new framework of political divisions on American soil. And probably for the better, for the simple fact is that this new paradigm forever shattered the old ways of thinking and laid waste to the "left-right" myths of the past.

As such, I cannot help but wonder how Ginny has adjusted to the new realities of the world stage. In many of what she would have considered her own "liberal" circles, it is no longer fashionable to support Israel any more than it was ever fashionable to support the Christian Zionist fanatics in America who place Israel first. And we find rising numbers of intellectuals—in the United States and around the planet—who are openly scornful of the Jewish Agenda. Zionism is now acknowledged to be the racist and supremacist ideology that it has always been.

And yet, at the same time—as we noted earlier—real Americanism and patriotism has been submerged into the Jewish swamp and the term "Americanism" is now being equated—both by the Jews (and, unfortunately, by some others who actually stand in opposition to the Jews)—as being a term that represents the Jewish Agenda, when, in reality, nothing could be further from the truth. Real Americanism opposes the New World Order and the dream of the Jewish Utopia that is the foundation for that scheme of global conquest.

For my own part, not long after the 9-11 tragedy, I came to the stark realization that the Jews were now using "Americanism" as a central rhetorical foundation of their chosen means of pursuing their global aims, most especially in the realm of waging the phony "war on terrorism" designed to establish Jewish hegemony in the Middle East.

Flag-waving and unabashed patriotism became quite in style after 9-11 and those of us who had always considered ourselves patriots (in the real sense) could only but laugh at those who were now wrapping themselves in the flag. For we real patriots knew that it was the Jewish media, in an effort to advance the Zionist cause, that had now brought flag-waving patriotism back into fashion.

Although I had seen it happening before my eyes—the daily "patriotism" in the Jewish-controlled mass media—it wasn't until late January of 2002 where the full impact of things hit home. I was sitting in the Baltimore airport, preparing for an international journey that would ultimately take me to Moscow. I remember being chilled at the sight of uniformed soldiers, carrying military assault rifles, patrolling the airport, presumably watching out for "them Mooozlims." It was unsettling. It was something that one might expect to see in a Hollywood film about a

treacherous Third World tinpot dictatorship. But this was Baltimore, the city of the Star Spangled Banner, right there in my America.

Shaking my head in disgust, I found myself a spot far away from the crowds which were slowly making their way through the intensified "security." Settling in, I watched as a yarmulke-wearing Orthodox Jew—a rabbi perhaps—took a seat about twenty feet away from me. In no short order, he pulled out a Hebrew-language Jewish prayer book and began pondering the ways of the world, no doubt reflecting on the animals (such as myself) surrounding him.

And it was then I noticed something on his lapel. I wondered if it were a star of David or some other Jewish symbol. Quite honestly curious, I stood up and moved a little closer, trying to not be too obvious. And I soon discovered what the symbol was: the American flag.

"A-ha!" I said to myself. "Now even the Jews will wear the American flag." In the past they were first and foremost among those to mock American patriotism as a symbol of the "old America" of days gone by.

I once had a "liberal" teacher call me—scoffingly—a "flag waving superpatriot." He was one of those liberals who loved "little Israel." Yet, today, I'm sure, he's out there waving the flag and wearing it on his lapel, just like the little Orthodox Jew in the Baltimore airport.

Now—in the "new" Jewish world of today—American patriotism and the flag are being used as mechanisms of control, means of propaganda, methods of political enforcement.

How extraordinarily audacious!

What chutzpah!

And God damn them for it.

Symbolism has always been part and parcel of the Jewish trickery and Talmudic legerdemain utilized to manipulate "The Other" and to send forth subtle messages meant to communicate hidden agendas and unspoken symbols—sorcery in the classic sense!

And this—as I've said, time and again, from the beginning of this massive missive—reflects the underlying nature of the battle that we are fighting in this 21st Century.

We hear over and over of "Adolf Hitler and the Nazis" and of "The Holocaust" and now of "Islamofascism" and "the Muslims" and Sharia Law" (which is equated to a modern manifestation of Hitlerism).

Who is it who insists we must relive "The Holocaust"?

Who is it who tells us we must beware of the Muslims and the "Islamofascists"?

Who is it?

It is not the Mennonites who control the mass media, nor is it the manifestly successful Korean-American community.

It is not the Presbyterians or the Buddhists who continually rant and rave about Adolf Hitler and the Muslims.

Nor we do hear any raging and never-ending call for war against Iran (or assorted other Muslim countries) coming from the Italian-American or Polish-American communities.

The propaganda linguistics of the New World Order are founded in the rhetoric that we have been talking about.

And while the Jewish community is quick to rush forward to condemn what it perceives to "improper" use of Nazi imagery, the bottom line truth is that it is the Jewish community that encourages it and uses it most often and most skillfully.

Writing in *The Washington Post* on January 23, 2011, Pulitzer Prize-winning conservative columnist Kathleen Parker, a tried-and-true Gentile voice for Jewish interests, remarked: "For my two cents, anyone who invokes Hitler or Nazis should be disqualified from public debate for muddled thinking and lack of originality."

Yet, despite these words, this poor foolish woman obviously never realized that it has always been her Jewish sponsors who have been first and foremost in invoking Hitler and the Nazis. If it didn't cross her mind, it should have. And if it did, her very words show what a damned hypocrite she is (putting it lightly) and precisely how literary shills for the Jews are willing to ignore all reality in advancing the Jewish agenda.

Again, it's all part of the damnable double-standard we find when it comes to the problem of anti-Semitism and the problems that anti-Semitism have caused for the world at large.

In our world today—and most especially in America—we are now confronted with what I have come to describe as "The Caiaphas Complex," recalling, of course, Caiaphas, the infamous high priest of the Pharisees who was responsible for the arrest and brutal execution of Jesus Christ. This Caiaphas Complex is—in short—the reality of Jewish power and its nature.

The word "complex" has multiple meanings and, as you'll see, the concept of The Caiaphas Complex is a remarkably accurate description of the state of affairs that faces non-Jews today as they grapple with the problem of anti-Semitism and all of its arising consequences.

In the first place, a complex is a whole composed of interconnected or interwoven parts. In America we see a very real complex that provides the foundation of Jewish power, ranging from the Jewish control of the American economy through the corrupt plutocratic Federal Reserve money system and the mass print and broadcast media that is dominated by an ever-smaller number of Jewish families and financial groups to the Jewish domination of diverse arenas ranging from academia and art

and "culture" to law and medicine, not to mention real estate, the garment and fashion industries and on to advertising which, in many respects, links all of this together.

If ever there was a complex of undoubted intricacy (and power) it is the Jewish complex—The Caiaphas Complex—and it has indeed come to be the preeminent force in directing what has traditionally been called the "military-industrial complex" that is now often (and quite correctly) referred to as the "military-industrial-media complex."

But the concept of a "complex" also includes the classic use of the term in the realm of psychology: a complex is a group of related, often repressed, ideas and impulses that compel characteristic or habitual patterns of thought, feelings, and behavior.

In the most specific sense, in the Jewish mindset, we do have a deeply-rooted historical pattern of thought and behavior toward non-Jews guided by the Talmud and by the most vile aspects of the Old Testament.

It is no coincidence that the Jews regard Jesus Christ as their greatest of all foes and this, too, points toward a central nexus in the problem of anti-Semitism: that as a consequence of the dirty deeds of Caiaphas, the Jews while—on the one hand, destroying Christ as man—set the stage for their age-old hatred of—and war against—Christ and Christianity that rages here on Earth today.

The Jews, in that respect, know that the Crime of the Ages as orchestrated by Caiaphas—the crucifixion of Jesus—will haunt them forever. And so, this aspect of the Caiaphas Complex genuinely deserves the commemoration of that infamous Pharisee by his name.

To continue: A complex, in more popular usage, refers to an exaggerated or obsessive concern or fear. And in the Jewish mind, there has always been an obsessive fear (and resulting hatred) of "The Other."

On the other hand, for their own purposes (and perhaps even instinctively) the Jews (as we have seen) have traditionally exaggerated the existence and reality of "anti-Semitism" and its consequences, even to the point of time and again ascribing to the Goyim responsibility for attitudes and actions against Jews that, more often than not, have been first traceable in history to the Jews themselves.

That is, the Jews blame others for crimes that they themselves—as a group—have been responsible for.

In medicine—in the matter of actual physical well being—a complex is the combination of factors, symptoms, or signs of a disease or disorder that forms a syndrome (that is, a set of symptoms occurring together; the sum of signs of any morbid state). In our world today we do have, in all reality, a very real complex in this definition of the word, arising

from the Jewish impact upon society: war and racial strife, social and cultural instability—a cerebral mass sense of discomfort and depression that tortures humanity as a consequence.

Lastly, a complex can also be defined as a group of culture traits relating to a single activity or to a culture unit—that is, a tribe.

We do indeed find Jewish cultural traits that have led them into a variety of particular realms of activity.

And let's be frank about it, usury is perhaps foremost among those identified with the Jews. Some might even suggest "entertainment"—using the term loosely, describing what passes for modern "culture" in the realm of the Jewish-controlled media—being another such activity that has a distinctly Jewish nature.

And certainly, what is Jewish culture (even as defined by the Jews) is one that is distinct, one that is tribal, one that sets the Jewish people apart from all others, as they are the first to proclaim.

As such, this monstrous complex that stands in place today can be no better named: The most notorious villain in human history—rivaled perhaps only by Judas Iscariot—thus personifies the reality of Jewish power and its impact upon mankind.

This is said with very real sadness and regret, recognizing fully that, as the popular refrain goes, "not all Jews are bad" (and they aren't) but still affirming in no uncertain terms that the actions and attitudes of the organized Jewish community (as it is now constituted) present a serious challenge to the future survival of life on our planet. If anything is unfortunately clear, it is that.

As a result of the power—ever-growing power—of The Calaphas Complex, the Jews are ever-present in our midst—in the forefront of our minds—and that is precisely because the Jews want that to be the case.

It is the Jewish-controlled mass media that keeps Jewish concerns, Jewish issues, Jewish matters before us, whether it has to do with the state of Israel or any other matter—especially, of course, "The Holocaust"—of concern to the Jews. And yet when anyone dares raise a concern about the media-enforced Judeo-centric focus of modern society, he is loudly shouted down as an "anti-Semite."

We hear repeatedly in the mass media that "the Nazis" referred to Jews as "*untermenschen*"—that is, "subhumans"—but how many non-Jews in the world today know that the Jews (and yes, the Jews as a group, and many, many Jews individually) refer to non-Jews as "Goyim"—that demeaning term that means "cattle" or "beast"?

And in case some sensitive readers can't figure out the point, it is this: the Jews do not even consider non-Jews to be even "subhuman." No, non-Jews are the equivalent of cattle—that is, non-human.

In this realm, by the way, the ancient Greeks and Romans thought of their slaves as livestock: in fact, the Greek term for "slave"—*andrapodon* (meaning "man-footed creature")—was founded on the common Greek term for cattle, *tetrapodon*, meaning "four-footed creature."

So the historic Jewish term referring to non-Jews can quite correctly be equated to the Greek term for slave. And this is no coincidence since, as we know all too well, the ultimate Jewish Utopia—the New World Order—will be a Global Plantation in which the Goyim are intended to be the slaves of the Jews.

It is thus worth noting, in this context, that David Livingstone Smith, in his 2011 book, *Less Than Human: Why We Demean, Enslave, And Exterminate Others* (published by St. Martin's), asserts that "When a group of people is dehumanized, they become mere creatures to be managed, exploited, or disposed of, as the occasion demands."

And so, then, can there be any doubt that the Jews—by anointing, that is, dehumanizing, non-Jews as non-humans—are simply doing no more than setting the linguistic foundation for the Jewish Utopia they expect to set in place in the future?

Again, it's all a matter of linguistics, whether it be conjuring up the image of Hitler and the Nazis and the Holocaust or by dehumanizing non-Jews. It's all part of the continuing—and never-ending—Jewish battering of mankind with the club of "anti-Semitism," the linguistic weapon that underlies the drive for a New World Order.

So today—in this, the 21st Century—the world finds itself a mere toy in the hands of the most powerful single group of people on the face of the planet, one which not only maintains significant influence in the United States and Britain and to a certain substantial degree in other nations of the West, but which also has a base of operations in the Middle East—the state of Israel—through which it manipulates the affairs of others (and not just in that region).

And what with the constant chaos and state of war that prevails in the Middle East—precisely as a consequence of the illegal (and certainly unethical) establishment of Israel in 1948—the ever-present possibility of nuclear war looms upon us.

There is, we find, a very real form of insanity raging in Israel (and among Jews worldwide). They proclaim that there is a rise in global anti-Semitism and that, ultimately, there could be a "second Holocaust." And for that reason, it is all too clear, the Jewish people are gearing up for the final countdown.

Here on American soil, they are tightening the screws of the police state and working to put an end to our liberties in the name of "fighting hate" and maintaining "homeland security."

And they are pushing to escalate continued exploitation of American blood and treasure in further Jewish wars of survival. And in Israel—mad, mad Israel—the Jews are literally relishing the opportunity of putting their atomic arsenal to use. They are determined—one way or another—to see the Jewish Hell Bomb once again unleashed upon the world.

It is no coincidence that American Jewish writer Ron Rosenbaum's 2011 book, *How the End Begins: The Road to a Nuclear World War III* (published by Simon & Schuster) makes it ultimately clear that a third world war (one stemming from the conflict over—and involving the likely use of—nuclear weapons) could almost certainly be instigated by Israel; quite conceivably a "preemptive" strike by Israel (using either nuclear or conventional weapons) against some other nation (probably Iran) in order to prevent that nation from acquiring nuclear arms.

This could then set off a resulting chain-reaction in the Middle East that could instigate the further use of nuclear weapons in the ensuing crisis that would erupt, potentially involving other nations including the United States, Russia, Pakistan, India—the list goes on and on.

In fact, Rosenbaum notes that when Israel launched a military strike on a presumed Syrian nuclear installation in 2007, the London-based *Spectator* published a little-noticed article on October 6 of that year quoting a senior British official who said that "If people had known how close we came to World War II that day there'd have been mass panic . . . [and we] really would have been dealing with the bloody Book of Revelation and Armageddon."

Yes, we *already* almost came to World War III—courtesy of Israel. Rosenbaum writes:

. . . The fact that the hand of man finds itself recurrently, obsessively scripting fiery, self-immolating cataclysmic conclusions to the human saga may well be, at the very least, self-fulfilling prophecy. It may also say that deep down, we really are a species obsessed with its own self-destruction—one that knows it deserves to be cleansed from the world, by fire this time.

And what Rosenbaum writes is particularly chilling since Israel's nuclear policy—from the beginning—has been based on the Samson Option (immortalized by Jewish-American Pulitzer Prize-winning critic of Israel, Seymour Hersh, in his book by that title): the concept that Israel would indeed commit nuclear suicide (and bring the rest of the world down with it) if Israel's leaders believed that Israel was about to be conquered by one of its enemies. And this theme of martyrdom and suicide, goes back to the legend of Masada, as discussed in Chapter Twenty-Six.

That Israel would not hesitate to use nuclear weapons for its own survival—or in pursuit of what it perceives to be its survival—is not mere speculation, as we have seen.

Nor is it not significant that in 2009 Israeli President Shimon Peres asserted that "History teaches us that overreaction is preferable to under-reaction." Israel is obsessed with "The Holocaust" and deeply-rooted in the fear of a "second Holocaust," to the point that, as Rosenbaum points out, such fears are a "powerful *strategic* factor" [his emphasis] and "one that may play an incalculable part in defining how the end will begin."

The idea of a "second Holocaust," writes Rosenbaum, "is a phrase that has become a potential motive, if not a trigger for, the outbreak of World War III in the Middle East." According to Rosenbaum, "Israelis tell me that the use of the phrase 'second Holocaust' has become normalized there."

Rosenbaum even suggests that Israelis perceive that the international conference on the Holocaust, held in Tehran in 2006 under the sponsorship of the Iranian government (and which I attended, as described in Chapter Twenty-Three) was an incitement to genocide, a deliberate call, in effect, for a "second Holocaust." He said:

It was an important event because it demonstrated how Holocaust denial—once the province of a few crackpots—has morphed into an instrument, a central strategic rationale, for those who want to perpetrate one "for real."

Rosenbaum cites his interview of Moshe Halbertal, a professor of ethics and the international law of war at both New York University Law School and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, describing Halbertal as "a much admired Talmudic scholar" and "revered ethicist" who is "one of the most widely respected thinkers on the moral and ethical dilemmas of modern warfare."

According to Rosenbaum, Halbertal says that, in some cases, a preemptive nuclear strike can be "moral" although, in Rosenbaum's assessment of Halbertal's views, "retaliation after being struck by nuclear weapons cannot be."

Yet, Rosenbaum points out, although Halbertal believes that Israel could have the right to launch a preemptive strike against Iran, for example, and although, in the alternative, Halbertal doesn't "see much point" in Israel launching a retaliatory attack in the event that it should happen to be the victim of a nuclear first-strike launched by another country, Halbertal seems to be saying, according to Rosenbaum, "it's going to happen whether I like it or not." Rosenbaum concludes: "It's almost a fatalistic admission that it will."

Reviewing the state of affairs in Israel and its mindset, Rosenbaum summarizes the situation as it stands:

All this will make it more like that—sooner or later—Israel will unleash nuclear weapons, risk inaugurating World War III—to prevent what they perceive as an impending nuclear strike. Israelis will not wait for the world to step in. They may not even wait to be sure their intelligence on the strike they wish to preempt is rock-solid certain. They can't afford to take that chance. It is not something I advocate; it is something I foresee.

Rosenbaum calls himself a "secular, liberal, nonobservant, non-Zionist American-born Jew with no immediate family members murdered in the Holocaust," and (thank God) he rightly fears the possibility of nuclear war. He closes his remarkable (and disturbing) book with this plea:

All I can say is—if this were my letter of last resort: If you're in a position to launch, whoever you are, now or in the future, if you're in a position to send the targeting codes, if it's up to you, whoever you are, my plea is "Nothing justifies following orders for genocide. Don't send those codes, don't twist those keys."

All I can say is: I wish more Jews thought like Rosenbaum.
But I know that they do not.

And I will add this: The Jews Must Be Stopped. The Jews must be stopped before their inherent madness (their Caiaphas Complex)—the consequence of thousands of years of anger and hatred toward the Goyim—overwhelms them and drives them toward the beginning of the end: their suicidal desire (and that's what it is) to launch a nuclear holocaust upon the rest of the peoples of the globe.

It is clearly something that they cannot resist.

And if they finally conclude that their drive for the New World Order is about to be derailed, they clearly will not hesitate to act.

Although the state of Israel—artificial that it is—is certain (as we noted earlier) to ultimately wither away or otherwise collapse within, that, too, presents us a danger, for at that juncture the Israelis will be ever more inclined to exercise their nuclear madness with a vengeance. And that is why action is needed now—rather than later—more than ever.

Unless there is a Second American Revolution in America that thrashes Jewish power by—most directly—breaking up the Jewish-controlled Federal Reserve System and the Jewish-controlled Media Monopoly and thereby returns the republic to the hands of the people, or, at the very least, to the hands of a responsible governing elite of some type, we can-

not hope that the United States (certainly not as we know it today) will play a part in bringing the Jewish plutocrats and warmongers to heel.

And should there be move toward revolution against Jewish power in America, we can be assured that the Jews of Israel will, in turn, utilize their Jewish Hell Bomb as a countermeasure.

And considering the fact, as I noted earlier, that Israel has literally been in control of most—and now if not all—American nuclear facilities on U.S. soil (in the guise of security), the Jewish counter-measures could be devastating indeed.

We can only imagine nuclear meltdown—as a consequence of Jewish sabotage—all over the United States.

Our spacious skies will be darkened by radioactive clouds.

Our amber waves of grain will be scorched to the earth.

Our purple mountain majesties will loom over mass devastation—from sea to shining sea.

Our alabaster cities will no longer gleam.

And that will be the end of America and the beginning of the end of the world.

America! America! God shed his grace on thee.

Give the American people the knowledge and the courage to do what is right and what is necessary.

We recall the simple words of that Hellish Bolshevik Jew Lenin:

"What is to be done?"

At this juncture, we can only pray that a consortium of international forces—perhaps led by Russia?—will vanquish Israel and thereby end the continuing threat of the Jewish Hell Bomb.

There is, of course, even a danger to the world inherent in such a measure—what with the likelihood of Jewish nuclear retaliation—but it may well be worth the risk in the long term.

And, of course, if independent nations banded together to put a stop to the Zionist citadel in the Middle East, at least, there is the tragic likelihood that the United States—under Jewish direction—would intervene militarily and almost certainly through nuclear means.

So the reality is that our choices are stark.

But choices must be made.

This is what I believe.

And this is why I have put these thoughts together in these pages.

It has been quite a journey for me, for it has brought back so many memories (many fond, many not) and it has also been educational for me (and I hope for the readers) as well.

In my own sometimes prolix way, I've sought to try to apply some common sense to a difficult topic that many people would sooner pre-

fer to ignore altogether or, in the alternative—as the likes of Alex Jones and Glenn Beck would have it—focus on the non-existent threat of Nazism in America, the idea that “the Nazis” laid the groundwork for—or are otherwise now perpetuating—the problems that plague us today.

Their rhetoric is but a modern version of the work of the World War II-era British “black propagandist”—Sefton Delmer—who told his henchmen: “We must never lie by accident, or through slovenliness, only deliberately. We are up to all the dirty tricks we can devise. No holes are barred. The dirtier the better. Lies treachery, everything.”

Jones and Beck and others of this ilk tell lie after lie about “Hitler and the Nazis” and shriek about “The Holocaust” as part of their unending campaign to distort the reality of what is happening in our world today. Every time they conjure up these images they gratuitously lend their support to ushering in the New World Order which relies so foundationally on this false rhetoric and upon historical lies. And while the likes of Jones and Beck would have us believe they offer an *alternative* to the “mainstream media” they are, in fact, *underscoring* its message.

Unfortunately, most people (especially Americans) are unable to see clearly through this proverbial “wilderness of mirrors”—blinded by the propaganda and the mythology, the linguistic legerdemain—and they fall into the carefully laid trap that pushes so many good people (unwittingly) into becoming agents of the New World Order themselves.

For my own part, I’m just a small town working class boy from the mountains of Pennsylvania, a kid who saw what was right and what was wrong. And spoke out! I dared to defy “conventional wisdom” and said “no” to the most powerful people in the world. In *The Quiet American*, Graham Greene wrote: “Sooner or later one has to take sides if one is to remain human.” Well, I *have* taken sides.

The wave of the future—as I see it—will be a revolution, a worldwide convulsion, against Jewish power. It is not only likely to happen. It will happen. And the Jews have only themselves to blame. People everywhere will begin to disengage themselves from the linguistic legerdemain of the New World Order and reassert their own nationhood. And it is my prayer that many Jewish folks will come to their senses and stand with others in the battle on the side of right.

Concerted global action shall force the Jewish elite to cease and desist in their imperial plan to impose their will—their presumed “destiny”—upon the world. And there will be the resolution of the theft and desecration of the Holy Land. Palestine will be restored to its people.

The time is coming soon and that wave of the future will crash down with a mighty roar and there will be resulting a final judgment of the Problem of Anti-Semitism.

The great Roman, Titus, sacked Jerusalem in 70 A.D. and brought a new era upon the world. However, as time progressed, his great accomplishment was ultimately undone and we find what passes for “civilization” existing as it does today. And when a New Titus arrives upon the scene—perhaps not as one man, but, rather, as many peoples united—the center of Jewish Power will once again be dealt a mortal blow.

Thomas Jefferson wrote that Jesus—as a “reformer of the superstitions of a nation,” a position, Jefferson said, which was “ever dangerous”—had to walk on what Jefferson referred to as “the perilous confines of reason and religion.”

A single misstep, he said, would place Jesus “within the grip of the priests of the superstition, a blood thirsty race . . . cruel and remorseless as the being whom they represented as the family God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, and the local God of Israel.”

The world of today must once and for all put an end to the influence of that which Jefferson described so well. And what truly is The Caiaphas Complex.

Americans need to forever dislodge from their positions of control those unholy Pharisees of that “depraved religion” who abused and manipulated the good people of the United States in order to advance their own twisted vision of Utopia.

In the end, we will abandon the old-fashioned party labels and phony “right-left” ideologies and work for social justice and humanitarian principles for all peoples of the earth who wish to share in the new world that is dawning in this, the 21st Century.

The obstructionists and enemies of nationalism and liberty will be broken on the unimpeded wheel of human history.

International nationalism—cooperation between all nations adhering to their own principles of sovereignty and non-interference in the affairs of others—will rule the day.

The serpent strangling mankind will be vanquished.

The shackles of Jewish tyranny will be broken; Jewish Communism and Jewish Capitalism will be consigned to the trashbin of history.

No more plutocracy and usury.

No more poverty and misery.

No more imperialism.

No more exploitation.


No more war.

No New World Order—no Jewish Utopia.

The Old Order—the Original Order—will be restored.

Resolving the Problem of Anti-Semitism is the Key to Global Peace.

—MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER



In the summer of 1994 my friend and colleague at *The Spotlight* newspaper, famed international correspondent Andrew St. George, discovered—quite by accident—a wiretap on his telephone at his apartment half-a-block from *The Spotlight* office and just a few doors away from my own home. I promptly rushed to my apartment and discovered likewise that “someone” had also tapped my phone, utilizing the same type of device—a multidirectional monitor—tucked inside an old-fashioned telephone polarity guard (as shown above). According to Andrew’s friend (and longtime *Spotlight* source), Richard Clement—who was in charge of security for all federal buildings in Washington, DC at the time—the wiretaps were of a primitive type, powered by attachment to the telephone line, and had the capacity to monitor activity even within the room up to about fifty feet. Clement said that usually those who were engaging in such covert surveillance would place these taps as a “dummy” that was intended to distract the person who discovered it. In fact, the real surveillance was being conducted through other more sophisticated means. “My” wiretap is shown above. As I have always said, “The Vatican didn’t put it there.”

APPENDIX

Yes, Everybody—So it Seems—is “Anti-Semitic”

This remarkable list of the diverse array of institutions and individuals who have been subjected to the charge of being “anti-Semitic” in one way or another demonstrates precisely how rife this accusation has been in our world, past and present. As you’ll see, many of those accused of “anti-Semitism” are actually Jewish themselves. Several additions have been made to this list, which was originally posted on the Internet by a thoughtful critic of Zionism whose identity remains unknown, but who obviously did some diligent research into the matter, recognizing how often-quite-laughable the accusation of “anti-Semitism” really is. So this list will prove quite revealing and thought-provoking—and amusing.

60 Minutes	Arthur Butz
9-11 skeptics	Arthur Miller
Africa and Africans	Australia and the Australians
African-Americans	Austria and the Austrians
Alan Rickman	Babylon and the Babylonians
Alex Hassinger	Barry Chamish
Albert Einstein	Benjamin Freedman
Albert S. Lindemann	Bernie Davids
Alfred Lilienthal	Bertrand Russell
Alexander Cockburn	British Broadcasting Company
<i>American Conservative</i>	Bible
American founding fathers	Bill Clinton
<i>American Free Press</i>	Bill Moyers
American Friends Service Committee	Bill O'Reilly
American media	Billy Graham
Amnesty International	black nationalism
Amos Oz	black nationalists
ancient Greece	Bo Gritz
Andrew Young	Bobby Fischer
Anglican Church	Bobby Ray Inman
Anglo-American establishment	Boston Globe
Anthony Lewis	Brandeis University
Antiwar.com	British Labor Party
Arab nationalism	Brooks Adams
Arab nationalists	Bryant Gumbel
Arabs	Bush 41 administration
Argentina and Argentines	Bush family
Ariel Sharon	Carl Jung
Arnold Leese	Carter administration
Arnold Schwarzenegger	Caspar Weinberger
Arnold Toynbee	Celine

Centre for Research on Globalization
 Charles Dickens
 Charles Guillian
 Charles M. Fischbein
 Charles Lindbergh
 Charley Reese
 Chris Matthews
 Christian conservatives
 Christian liberals
 Christian Science Monitor
 Christian Zionism
 Christian Zionists
 Christiane Amanpour
 Christianity and Christians
 Christopher Hitchens
 Christopher Lydon
 Christopher Marlowe
 CIA (Central Intelligence Agency)
 Cicero
 Cindy Sheehan
 CNN
 Colin Powell
 Communism and Communists
 Condoleezza Rice
 conservatives
 Cornel West
 Counterpunch
 Corporation for Public Broadcasting
 critics of ADL spying on Americans
 critics of AIPAC
 critics of AIPAC spying on Americans
 critics of Ariel Sharon
 critics of Greater Israel
 critics of Israeli settlements
 critics of Jewish fundamentalism
 critics of Jewish terrorism
 critics of Jonathan Pollard
 critics of Judaism
 critics of Likud
 critics of Menachem Begin
 critics of neoconservatism
 critics of neoconservatives
 critics of neoliberalism
 critics of neoliberals
 critics of Orthodox Judaism
 critics of Reform Judaism
 critics of the Anti-Defamation League
 critics of the Iraq War
 critics of the Israeli government
 critics of Yitzhak Shamir
 critics of Zionism
 Cynthia McKinney
 Cyrus Vance
 D.H. Lawrence
 D.W. Griffith
 Dale Crowley, Jr.
 Daniel Barenboim
 Daniel Kurtzer
 Daryl Bradford Smith
 David Axelrod
 David Duke
 David Icke
 David Irving
 David Rockefeller
 David Shipler
 Democratic Party
 Democrats
 DeWest Hooker
 Don Black
 Don Hewitt
 Doug Ireland
 Dwight Eisenhower
 E. Stanley Rittenhouse
 Eastern Europe
 Eastern Europeans
 Edward R. Fields
 Edward Gibbon
 Edward S. Herman
 Edward Said
 Egypt and the Egyptians
 Ehud Barak
 Ehud Olmert
 England and the English
 Enlightenment intellectuals
 Eric Margolis
 Ernest Hemingway
 Ernst Zundel
 EU (European Union)
 Europe and the Europeans
 European media
 European nationalism
 European nationalists

Eustace Mullins
 Ezra Pound
 Federal Bureau of Investigation
 Fox News
 France and the French
 Francis Fukuyama
 Francois Genoud
 Franklin D. Roosevelt
 Frederick Law Olmsted
 Fredrick Toben
 French nationalism
 French nationalists
 Fyodor Dostoevsky
 G.K. Chesterton
 Gary Hart
 Geoffrey Wheatcroft
 George Ball
 George Bernard Shaw
 George Carlin
 George Galloway
 George H.W. Bush
 George W. Bush
 German nationalism
 German nationalists
 Germany and the Germans
 Germar Rudolf
 Gerry Adams
 Gilad Atzmon
 God
 Goethe
 Gore Vidal
 Goyim – all non-Jews
 Grace Halsell
 Greece and the Greeks
 Greek Orthodox
 H.G. Wells
 H. Keith Thompson
 H.L. Mencken
 Hannah Arendt
 Hans Schmidt
 Harold Pinter
 Harry Belafonte
 Harry Browne
 Harry Truman
 Harvard University
 Haviv Schieber
 Hasidic Jews
 Hellenism and Hellenists
 Hellenized Jews
 Henry Adams
 Henry Ford
 Henry Siegman
 Hesham Tillawi
 Hilaire Belloc
 Hillary Clinton
 Holocaust skeptics
 Howard Dean
 Hugo Chavez
 Human Rights Watch
 Hungary and the Hungarians
 Internet
 IRA (Irish Republican Army)
 Iran and the Iranians
 Iraq and the Iraqis
 Ireland and the Irish
 Islam and Muslims
 Israel and the Israelis
 Israel Shahak
 Israel Shamir
 J. Orin Grabbe
 J. William Fulbright
 Jack Bernstein
 Jack London
 James Angleton
 James Baker
 James Bamford
 James Ennes
 James Forrestal
 James Norman
 James Traficant
 James K. Warner
 James Webb
 James Wolcott
 James Wolfensohn
 Japan and the Japanese
 Jeff Rense
 Jerome Brentar
 Jerry Falwell
 Jesse Helms
 Jesse Jackson
 Jesus Christ
 Jewish anti-Zionists

Jewish Communists
 Jewish conservatives
 Jewish converts to Christianity
 Jewish converts to Islam
 Jewish fundamentalists
 Jewish liberals
 Jewish prophets
 Jewish secularists
 Jewish socialists
 Jews for Jesus
 Jim Robinson
 Jimmy Carter
 Joan Baez
 Jodie Foster
 Joe Fields
 Joel Bainerman
 John Connally
 John deNugent
 John F. Kennedy
 John F. Kennedy Jr.
 John Grisham
 John Gunther Dean
 John Kreidl
 John Le Carre
 John Lennon
 John Mearnsheimer
 John Nash
 John Summu
 John Tiffany
 John Tyndall
 Jorge Haider
 Joseph Campbell
 Joseph P. Kamp
 Joseph Kennedy
 Joseph Sobran
 Joseph Stalin
 Joseph Wilson
 Judah Magnes
 Judaism
 Jude Wanniski
 Juergen Graf
 Juergen Moellmann
 Justin Raimondo
 Karl Marx
 Kate Smith
 Kathleen Christison
 Ken Livingstone
 Kennedy administration
 Kennedy family
 Kevin MacDonald
 Kofi Annan
 Kurt Nimmo
 Labor Party (Israel)
 Larry David
 Lawrence Dennis
 Lee Hockstader
 Leon T. Hadar
 Lew Rockwell
 Lew Rockwell.com
 liberalism and liberals
 libertarianism and libertarians
 Liberty Lobby
 Libya and the Libyans
 Likud Party (Israel)
 Louis Farrakhan
 Lubavitcher Jews
 Lutherans
 Lyndon LaRouche
 Mahathir Mohamad
 Mahatma Gandhi
 Malaysia and the Malaysians
 Malcolm X
 Mark Bruzonsky
 Mark Dankof
 Mark Glenn
 Mark Lane
 Mark Twain
 Marlon Brando
 Martin Heidegger
 Martin Kilson
 Martin Luther
 Marxism and Marxists
 Mary Robinson
 Matthias Chang
 Maureen Dowd
 Meir Kahane
 Mel Gibson
 Michael A. Hoffman
 Michael Collins Piper
 Michael Jackson
 Michael Lerner
 Michael Lind

Michael Rivero
 Michael Scheuer
 Michel Chossudovsky
 Mike Wallace
 Mohammed
 Monty Python
 Napoleon Bonaparte
 neoconservative apostates
 New Testament
New York Review of Books
New York Times
 New Zealand
 New Zealand
 New Zealanders
 Nicholas II
 Nixon administration
 Noam Chomsky
 Norman Finkelstein
 Norway and the Norwegians
 NPR (National Public Radio)
 oil industry and oil lobby
 Old Testament
 Orthodox Judaism
 Orthodox Jews
 Oswald Spengler
 Pacquita DeShishmaraff
 paganism and pagans
 Pakistan and the Pakistanis
 Palestinian nationalism
 Palestinian nationalists
 Palestinians
 Pat Robertson
 Patrick Buchanan
 Patrick Fitzgerald
 Patrick Lang
 Paul Christian Wolff, Jr.
 Paul Craig Roberts
 Paul de Man
 Paul Findley
 Paul Fromm
 Paul Gottfried
 Paul Wellstone
 Public Broadcasting Service
 Persia and Persians
 Pete Seeger
 Peter Jennings
 Peter Papaherklis
 Peter Sellars
 Phil Donahue
 Phil Ochs
 Phil Tourney
 Philip Roth
 Philip Weiss
 Pink Floyd
 Poland and the Poles
 Presbyterians
 Protestantism and Protestants
 Public Enemy
 Rachel Corrie
 Rahm Emanuel
 Rainer Werner Fassbinder
 Ralph Forbes
 Ralph Grandinetti
 Ralph Nader
 Ramsey Clark
 Ray McGovern
 Raymond Goodwin
 Reagan administration
 Red Cross
 Reform Judaism and Reform Jews
 religious Jews
 Renouf, Michele
 Rense.com
 Republican Party
 Republicans
 Richard Curtiss
 Richard Nixon
 Richard Wagner
 Roald Dahl
 Robert L. Brock
 Robert Fisk
 Robert Frost
 Robert I. Friedman
 Robert Mitchum
 Robert Novak
 Robert Redford
 Rodney Stark
 Roman Catholic Church
 Roman Catholics
 Rome and the Romans
 Ronald Reagan
 Roosevelt administration

- Rumania and the Rumanians
 Rupert Murdoch
 Russia and the Russians
 Saddam Hussein
 Satmar Jews
 Saudi Arabia and the Saudis
 Scott McConnell
 Scott Ritter
 Scott Winchester
 secular Jews
 self-hating Jews
 Seymour Hersh
 Sheldon Richman
 Sherman Skolnick
 Shimon Peres
 Sidney Hook
 Sinn Fein
 Soviet Union
 Spinoza
 Spiro Agnew
 St. Thomas Aquinas
 State Department
 Stephen Walt
 Steven Spielberg
 Strobe Talbott
 Syria and the Syrians
 T.S. Eliot
 Tacitus
 Ted Turner
 Texe Marrs
The Barnes Review
 the human race
The Nation
 the nations
The Spotlight
 the universe
The Village Voice
 the world
 Theodore Dreiser
 Thomas Edison
 Thomas Friedman
 Thomas Jefferson
 Thomas Paine
Tikkun
 Tim Burton
 Tim LaHaye
 Tim Wise
 Tom Segev
 Tony Blair
 Tony Blizzard
 Truman Capote
 Turkey and the Turks
 Udo Walendy
 U.S. Defense Department
 U.S. State Department
 Ukraine and the Ukrainians
 ultra-Orthodox Jews
 Ulysses S. Grant
 UN (United Nations)
 UNESCO
 UNICEF
 United States and Americans
 Uri Avnery
USS Liberty survivors
 Van Loman
 Vanessa Redgrave
 Venezuela and the Venezuelans
 Victor Ostrovsky
 Victor Thorn
 Vladimir Putin
 Voltaire
 Walt Disney
Washington Post
Washington Report/Mid East Affairs
 Wayne Madsen
 World Council of Churches
 Western Europe
 Western Europeans
 What Really Happened
 white nationalism
 white nationalists
 William Grimstad
 William Pierce
 William Shakespeare
 Willis Carto
 Winston Churchill
 Woody Allen
 Yehoshafat Harkabi
 Yitzhak Rabin
 Zbigniew Brzezinski
 Zionism and Zionists
9-11 Evil, 188
 9-11 Terrorist Tragedy, 47, 141, 152, 161, 188-89, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 232-33, 335, 340, 347, 348-50, 352, 442-43, 455
 Abu Dhabi (Michael Collins Piper visits), 226-259
 Adams, Brooks (on Jewish power), 14
 Adams, Henry (on Jewish power), 14
 Adams, John (on Judaism), 318-319
 African-Americans and Jewish power, 105-119
 African Slave Trade and the Jews, 84, 106-107, 119, 356
 Ahmadinejad, Mahmoud, 25, 66, 291, 429
American Free Press, 60, 183, 187, 188, 199, 228, 229, 249, 261, 264, 265, 273, 281, 293, 348, 430, 455
 "Americanism" as Jewish propaganda tool, 442-43
 American politicians and Jewish influence, 166-67, 355, 387-94
An Appeal to Reason, 2, 111
 Anthrax attacks, Jewish connection to, 348-350
 Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, 9, 56-61, 65, 94, 107, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 153, 160, 166, 167, 184, 185, 190-91, 246-48, 252-53, 258-59, 264, 274, 275, 354, 355, 356, 358, 360, 361, 363-74, 379-80, 408, 411, 456
 Anti-Semitism as beneficial to Jews, 361, 385
 Anti-Semitism, various definitions and usage related to, 21, 23-27
 Anti-Semitism traced to bad toilet training (!), 169-170
 Anti-Zionism called "Anti-Semitism," 44-53
 Anti-Zionist Jews, 44, *passim*
 Arab world, Jewish pressure on, 258-259 (also see Islam)
Barnes Review/The, 30, 62, 111, 121, 122, 131, 199, 223, 281, 299, 398
 Beck, Glenn, 22, 23, 48, 452
Best Witness, 28, 198, 294, 295, 296, 297
 Birobidjan as solution to Zionist problem, 342, 343-45, 397
 Bradley, Michael, 121, 124-28
 Buckley, William F. (as asset of Jewish Trotskyism), 162, 400-402
 Bolshevism in Russia, 224, 308, 396, 397, 398, 399, 425, 426, 451
Brainwashed for War, 261, 285
 Brock, Dr. Robert L., 295, 459
 Brummett, Gary (*U.S.S. Liberty* survivor), 207
 Bullock, Roy (ADL spy), 184, 247, 364-74
 Canada, (Michael Collins Piper visits), 438
 Cantor, Eric, 390-91, 394
 Carto, Willis A., 28, 44, 60, 61, 62-63, 111, 121, 128, 176, 184, 188, 199, 217, 260, 262, 281, 294-97, 367-74, 398, 401, 404, 405, 408, 460
 Catastrophic Zionism, 329-330

Chang, Matthias, 62, 260, 261, 285
 Christian Zionism, 189-456
 Christianity vs. Judaism,
 Clinton, Bill & Hillary, 221-22, 249, 455, 457
 Connally, John B. Connally (Jewish call for assassination of), 178-81
 Conspiracy by U.S. Ambassador to censor Michael Collins Piper, 273-277
 Cooper, Rabbi "Abie," 264-66, 275, 255-56
 Criticism of Jews called inherently "false," 416
 Dankof, Mark, 208
 Dennis, Lawrence, 2, 298, 408, 458
 Dershowitz, Alan, 359-360
Dirty Secrets, 199, 266
 Disraeli, Benjamin (says Jews are superior race), 97-98
Dracula as anti-Semitic imagery, 416-17
 Duke, David, 61, 62, 223, 280, 282-283, 363, 418
 Electoral College supported by Jews, 166-67
 Falwell, Jerry, 147, 168, 256, 457
 Farrakhan, Minister Louis, 84, 104, 106, 406, 418, 458
 Federal Reserve System, 59, 199, 228, 409-10, 444, 450
Final Judgment, 59, 113, 114, 115, 185, 186, 195, 249-53, 261-66, 270, 273, 274, 350, 410, 435
 Foxman, Abraham, 49, 56, 117, 190-191, 360
 Fromm, Paul, 438
Future Fastforward, 261, 285
 Genoud, Francois, 404
 Giuliani, Rudy, 352-353
 Glenn, Mark, 26, 208, 267, 342, 423, 458
Golem, The, 196, 440 (also see Jewish Hell-Bomb)
 Graf, Juergen, 223, 224
 Grand Pre, Donn, 208
 Gulliani, Lisa, 199, 266
 Haman, 142-143, 179, 418
 Hess, Stan, 267
 Hitler, Adolf (and Nazis) as propaganda tool, 22-44,
 Holocaust (and Hitler and Nazism) as a propaganda tool, 22-44, 49, 50, 51, 52, 60, 61, 63, 77, 78, 156, 198-199, 207, 209, 279-93, 294-97, 328, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337-40, 347, 382-83, 384, 426-29, 435, 437, 441, 443-44, 445, 447, 449, 452
 Holocaust problems caused by Jewish agitation, 28-43
 Hooker, DeWest, 405-411
 Intellectuals as leaders of anti-Semitism, 72-75, 78-79
 Iran Holocaust Conference, 60, 62-63, 279-293


Irish immigrants to America targeted by Jews, 356
 Islam and Muslims targeted by New World Order, 26-27, 48, 189, 206, 269-272, 278, 316, 330-331, 349, 391, 443-444
 Islam, 26, 47, 48, 52, 138, 139, 140, 141, 144, 149, 158, 176, 210, 228, 231, 233, 235, 257, 261, 270-72, 278, 291, 325, 349, 401, 402, 429, 443, 457
 Israel, Steven J., 181-183
 Israel destined to decay, 315-342
 Israel, potential for civil war in, 322-328
 Israel as a suicide state, 87, 147-49, 333,
 Israeli nuclear weapons, 87, 147-49, 333,
 Israel as a failed state, 315-342
 Israeli mistreatment of Christians and Muslims, 26, 72, 145-46, 329, 335, 336-40, 341, 415
 Japan, Michael Collins Piper lectures in, 260, 261-63, 265-66, 430
 Japanese-American assets looted by Jewish crime syndicate, 351
 Japanese nationalism, 260, 262-63, 265, 267, 430-31
 Jefferson, Thomas (on Judaism), 139-140, 453
 Jesus Christ and Christianity defamed by Jews, 142-145, 356
 Jesus Christ revered by Muslims, 278
 Jewish attitude toward non-Jews, 89-103, 105-119
 Jewish crime syndicate in United States, 56, 114, 251, 270, 350-51, 407
 Jewish criminal history, 71, 82-84, (also see "Jewish terrorism")
 Jewish Defense League, 9, 20, 204, 359, 435
 Jewish groups and "McCarthyism," 160-161
 Jewish groups funded by U.S. taxpayers, 137-138
 Jewish Hell-Bomb, 196, 205, 419, 432, 448, 451 (also see Israeli nuclear weapons and Israel as a suicide state)
 Jewish Humor and Vulgarism, 421-425
 Jewish looting of Japanese-American assets, 351
 Jewish persecution of Christians, 142-145, 356-357
 Jewish political power in America, 166-167, 355, 387-94
 Jewish racial and religious "history," 121-136
 Jewish religion, 89-103, 121-150, 142-145, 356, *passim*
 Jewish ritual murder, 357
 Jewish superiority, 89-103, 105-119
 Jewish support for the Electoral College, 166-167
 Jewish terrorism, 204, 205-208, 290-210, 268, 272
 Jewish threats against non-Jews, 87, 147-49, 333, 418-419
 Jewish money in U.S. elections, 355, 387-94
 Jones, Alex, 22, 23, 27, 452
 Judaism as a political force, 137-168
 Judaism replaced by Christianity, 141

Judas Goats, The, 94, 112, 160, 184, 196, 197, 363, 364, 373, 377, 400, 402
 "Judeo-Christianity" myth, 358-59
 Kennedy, John F. (assassination), 58, 59, 60, 185-86, 195, 205, 207-08, 214-15, 249-53, 270-71, 274
 Kennedy, Joseph P. and Jewish power, 404, 405-411
 Kennedy, Robert F. and the Jews, 7, 108-110, 215
 Kerry, John (confronted by Michael Collins Piper), 212
 Khazar origins of many modern Jews, 123-129
 King, Martin Luther (Assassination), 113-116
 King, Martin Luther, and Zionism, 105-119
 Know-Nothing movement controlled by Jews, 356
 Kristol, Irving, 165, 255, 317, 415
 Kristol, William, 165, 220-23, 230, 255
 Lansky, Meyer, 185, 251, 350, 393 (also see Jewish crime syndicate)
 Leese, Arnold, 159, 189, 455
 Levin, Carl (confronted by Michael Collins Piper), 213
 Levin, Lewis, 356
 Lewinsky, Monica, 58, 220, 221-22, 249, 255-56
Liberty, U.S.S., 6, 205-208, 335, 433
 Liberty Lobby and *The Spotlight*, 111, 176, 178, 180, 181, 183, 184, 186, 199, 201, 213, 217, 218, 222, 294, 297, 362, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 370, 371, 372, 373, 376, 377, 378, 435, 450, 458, 460
 Lipstadt, Deborah, 28, 294-97
 Lyons, Kirk, 374-79
 Lowell, James Russell (on Jewish power), 14
 Malaysia, Michael Collins Piper lectures in, 10, 52, 260, 261, 263-65, 269-72, 273-77
 Marcos, Imelda, on Jewish power, 217-219
 Marrs, Texe, 59, 450
 McCain, John, 355-56
 "McCarthyism" and Jewish groups, 160-161
 McGovern, George (opposed by Jews), 163-64
 Media, Zionist control of, 11, 12, 23, 26, 27, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 47, 50, 56, 58, 59, 61, 63, 66, 74, 75, 77, 82, 90, 93, 100, 108, 109, 127, 138, 144, 145, 148, 149, 151, 152, 155, 159, 161, 166, 168, 176, 178, 180, 181, 188-89, 191, 196, 198, 199, 200, 206, 208, 210, 216, 218, 219, 221, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236-57, 258, 263, 264, 265, 269, 271, 272, 278, 279, 280, 281, 232, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291, 293, 297, 300, 306, 317, 322, 325, 327, 331, 323, 342, 346-61, 363, 373, 375, 380, 381, 385, 386, 395, 402, 403, 407, 408, 421, 428, 434, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 450
 Media double standards on Jewish issues, 346-61
 Military, U.S. (leaders oppose Jewish power), 216

Mohamad, Dr. Mahathir, 7, 10, 25, 261, 263, 269, 458
 Moynihan, Daniel (confronted by Michael Collins Piper), 213-214
 Mullins, Eustace, 298, 299, 419, 457
 Muslims (see Islam)
My First Days in the White House, 299
 Naylor, Colonel Dallas Texas, 178
 Nazi Germany and Jewish Scholarship, 79-83
 Nazism, see Holocaust
 Neanderthal origins of the Jews, 121-128
 Neo-Conservatives as Modern-Day Trotskyites, 400-402
New Babylon, The, 23-24, 151, 194, 319, 325, 350, 356
New Jerusalem, The, 194, 266, 271, 273, 274
 New World Order (the Jewish Utopia), 9, 22, 23-28, 29, 30, 43, 53, 59, 72, 103, 139, 149, 162, 164, 165, 168, 177, 185, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 206, 224, 225, 262, 271, 325, 403, 413, 427, 428, 430, 431, 434, 439, 442, 444, 447, 450, 452, 453
 Nixon, Richard, 7, 41, 163, 175, 179, 249, 253-55, 410, 459
No Beauty in the Beast, 342
 Ohta, Dr. Ryu, 260, 262-63, 265, 267, 430-31
 Oklahoma City Bombing, 199, 362, 377-78
 Philo-Semitism as a phenomenon, 68
 Piper, Robert and Helen, 172, 177, 183
 Podhoretz, Norman, 164-165
 Pound, Ezra, 7, 298-314, 457
 Prison industry in U.S. dominated by Israeli interests, 438-439
 Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, 57-58, 60, 73, 80, 269, 309
 Purim (Jewish holiday celebrating genocide), 142-43, 397
 Putin, Vladimir, 25-26, 403, 429, 460
 Roman Catholic immigrants targeted by American Jews, 356
 Quayle, Dan, 388, 439
 Reagan, Ronald (and Jewish crime syndicate), 350-51, 406-407, 459
 Renouf, Lady Michele, 62, 280, 343, 344
 Republican Party and Jewish power,
 Roeder, Manfred, 430-31
 Rubin, Irv, 5, 435
 Rumsfeld, Donald, 388
 Russia in the 21st Century, 395-403
 Russia, Michael Collins Piper lectures in, 223-225
 Russian-Jewish crime families in USA, 352-354
 Russell, Bertrand, on Jewish Bolshevism, 425
 Scranton, William, 162-63
 Shariah Law, See Islam

Shadow Money Lenders, The, 261, 285
 Siffleet, Leonard, 414, 420
 Simon, Paul (confronted by Michael Collins Piper), 211-212
 Southern Poverty Law Center, 360, 378, 379, 411
Spotlight, The (See Liberty Lobby and *The Spotlight*)
 St. George, Andrew, 217, 454
 Strassmeir, Andreas, 377-78
 Stalin, Josef (as enemy of Jewish power), 396-402, 437, 458
 Talmud & Talmudism, 23, 74, 95, 139, 143, 145, 147, 169, 194, 202, 206, 224, 229, 280, 308, 325, 326, 327, 359, 417, 435, 443, 445, 449
 Traficant, Jim, 7, 198, 457
Target: Traficant, 198
 Thorn, Victor, 188, 199, 266, 460
 Toben, Fredrick, 62, 223, 281, 457
 Tourney, Phil (*U.S.S. Liberty* survivor), 6, 207
 Trotsky, Leon, 397, 400, 401
 Trotskyites and Neo-Conservatives, 400-402
 United States and Israel Against the World, 298
U.S.S. Liberty, 6, 205-208, 335, 433
 Vanunu, Mordechai, 260, 266-67
 Voltaire on the Jews, 71-72, 348, 460
 Watergate affair, 58, 249, 253-255
 Waters, Ruth Cramer, 177, 183-84
 White Slavery and the Jews, 71, 83-84
 Wiesenthal Center, 217, 229, 261, 264-66, 275, 287, 360
 Wiesenthal, Simon, 37, 40, 382
 Wiesel, Elie, 37, 39, 40, 336
 World War II, 408-409, (Also see Holocaust, Hitler, etc)
 Zionism, 24, 44-53, 55, 59, 72, 91, 102, 116, 118, 128, 129, 130, 145, 162, 189, 195, 196, 202, 212, 224, 235, 247, 269, 272, 274, 283, 316, 318, 322, 325, 328, 329, 330, 333, 335, 340, 342, 295, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400-402, 426, 442, *passim*

More "Must-Read" Best-Sellers
 By America's No-Holds-Barred
 Author, Lecturer &
 Radio Talk Show Host
MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER




The New Babylon: Those Who Reign Supreme

*A Panoramic Overview of the Historical, Religious
and Economic Origins of the New World Order*

*Inside the Rothschild Empire:
The Modern-Day Pharisees*

Although there has been much written about the New World Order and the Rothschild Empire, this is the first book ever to document, from the beginning, the truth about this worldwide geopolitical phenomenon. In these pages, Michael Collins Piper explains in no uncertain terms the long-suppressed origins of the New World Order and the global engine of tyranny rooted in the financial empire of the Rothschild Dynasty. Examining the New World Order's religious and philosophical roots in Jewish teachings spawned in ancient Babylon, Piper explores the manner in which followers of the Jewish Talmud rose to the highest levels in finance. And today, with the Rothschild network firmly entrenched on American soil, the United States today has emerged as "The New Babylon" from which these modern-day Pharisees are working to set in place a global hegemon that many call the New World Order. Relying upon many rare works (some never before published in English), Piper has assembled the entirety of the history of the sordid intrigue that has established itself as the unrivaled plutocratic elite in our world today. This is a virtual guidebook to the path toward mankind's survival.


The New Babylon, softcover, 280 pages. \$25 per copy. Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to a major credit card.



My First Days in the White House *Michael Collins Piper's First-Ever Work of Fiction— or Is It Fiction?*

Many of Mike's Piper's more serious friends told him: "Don't publish this book. Your readers are used to your non-fiction writings. If you publish this novel, nobody will ever take you seriously again." Piper defied his friends and published *My First Days in the White House*. This is a tongue-in-cheek—but still deadly serious—"memoir" in which Piper describes how a military coup against the corrupt administration of George W. Bush—the Second American Revolution—unexpectedly catapulted Piper into the White House and of the amazing revolutionary populist and nationalist reforms that Piper and his fellow revolutionaries accomplished. Often humorous in tone, but nonetheless controversial and politically-charged and most definitely a defiant enunciation of uncomfortable facts about the realities of American political life, this work tackles the big issues no-holds-barred: the Federal Reserve money monopoly; Zionist power and intrigue; free trade and internationalism; the media monopoly and the global gold market—both controlled by the Rothschild Empire, race and immigration problems; rescuing the family farm; bringing real reform to health care and providing holistic and homeopathic remedies to the fore; changing the American political system to secure the republican form of government. All of this and more. You may be shocked. You may be amused. You may vow to never read anything by Piper again. But this book will make you think about American political affairs as perhaps you've never done before. A roller-coaster ride into the future!

My First Days in the White House, softcover, 224 pages. \$25 per copy. Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to a major credit card.



Zionist Influence on the American Media

Michael Collins Piper's Historic Address to the Arab League

On March 10, 2003, Michael Collins Piper sparked a firestorm of frenzy from the powerful Zionist lobby in America, when he addressed the topic of "Zionist Influence on the American Media." Piper was the featured speaker at the Arab League's official think tank, the distinguished Zayed Centre for Coordination and Follow-Up based in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates.



Here's the un-censored text of Piper's historic speech—the first ever in more than fifty years by an American nationalist to an official assembly of the Arab League. Read for yourself what journalists, ambassadors and opinion-makers from around the globe heard in Abu Dhabi.

Piper upset the Zionists for daring to say who really controls the media in America and how they have used that power to shape the course of American and world affairs.

In this presentation, Piper unveiled the role of the Israeli lobby in misdirecting U.S. foreign policy and described the intrigues surrounding the JFK assassination, the Monica Lewinsky affair and other recent events of American history.

There is no copyright on this document. This 8.5 x 11 document is yours to reproduce at your own expense for widespread distribution.

Zionist Influence on the American Media, softcover, Six two-sided pages (numbered 1-12). Donation: \$10.


Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to a major credit card.

TARGET: TRAFICANT

*The Outrageous Inside Story
of How the Justice Department, the Israeli Lobby
and the American Mass Media
Conspired to Set Up and Take Down
Congressman Jim Traficant*

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

In *TARGET: TRAFICANT*, author Michael Collins Piper—whom Jim Traficant has said was the only journalist to tell his story truthfully from the beginning—has assembled this eye-opening overview of the campaign by high-level forces to destroy the no-nonsense populist congressman. The Traficant case represents one of the most outrageous hit-and-run operations ever orchestrated against an American public official. Piper dissects the intrigues of the Justice Department and the FBI and demonstrates, beyond any doubt, that the congressman was absolutely innocent of all of the charges on which he was convicted and that, in fact, the entire criminal case against him was fabricated through and through. If you ever had any doubts about Traficant's integrity, this is the one book that will put all of your doubts to rest. Includes a special appendix outlining the previous Justice Department frame-up of former Pennsylvania State Treasurer Budd Dwyer resulting in his tragic public suicide.



Target: Traficant, softcover, 176 pages, \$25.

Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to a major credit card.

THE NEW JERUSALEM


Zionist Power in America

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

Unlike anything ever published in the modern day, this explosive study combines in 184 pages, for the first time ever between two covers, the amazing facts and figures which document the massive accumulation of wealth and power by those who have used that influence to direct the course of U.S. foreign and domestic policy today. While there are many historical books on "the Israeli lobby," Zionism, etc, this is the only book that brings things "up to date" and constitutes a bold and thorough inquiry. What makes this volume so particularly powerful is that the author, Michael Collins Piper, relied exclusively on Jewish sources to compile the wide-ranging array of data in these pages. All sources are carefully annotated for the reader's reference. Chapters include a list of prominent figures throughout history accused of "anti-Zionism" and "anti-Semitism," a dissection of the Bronfman family—"the Royal family of American Zionism," an eye-opening summary of some 200 little-known, immensely wealthy Zionist families in America; a fascinating inquiry into the infamous Enron and INSLAW affairs, documenting the suppressed "Zionist connection" plus more. (NOTE: although much of this material—but not all—was reincorporated into the pages of Piper's 2008 book, *The New Babylon*, this earlier volume, *The New Jerusalem*, is an excellent way to introduce new readers to a difficult topic.)

The New Jerusalem, softcover, 176 pages, \$20.

Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to Va major credit card.




THE GOLEM:

Israel's Nuclear Hell Bomb and the Road to Global Armageddon

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

In this landmark work, veteran author Michael Collins Piper pulls no punches in asserting that Israel's nuclear Hell Bomb is pushing civilization toward global Armageddon, that the perpetuation of this uncontrolled weapons program has left the world held hostage. Piper explains the danger the planet faces as a direct consequence of American collaboration with a nuclear-armed Israel, a nation which has an open historical record of hostility to other peoples, based on little-known Jewish religious teachings that have been the philosophy upon which Israel—since its earliest days—has worked relentlessly to construct an atomic arsenal—its Golem—the foundation of its national security strategy. Outlining the whole shocking story, Piper demonstrates that America's international policy has been hijacked by well-heeled supporters of Israel who—in combination with a mass media dominated by Jewish financial interests—have become the masters of America's destiny and that of mankind itself. Piper calls this phenomenon "the 'Israelization' of American foreign policy." A mammoth record of indisputable facts pointing toward the unmistakable conclusion: That the people of the United States and the world must work together to ensure Israel's Golem is dismantled.

The Golem, softcover, 198 pages, \$25.



Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to a major credit card.

DIRTY SECRETS

Crime, Conspiracy & Cover-Up in the 20th Century


Based on the Writings and Interviews of Michael Collins Piper

Compiled and Edited by Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Mordechai Vanunu—the Nobel Peace Prize nominee who blew the whistle on Israel's illegal nuclear weapons program and served 18 years in an Israeli prison for doing so—has called Michael Collins Piper one of the most "brave and honest" journalists writing today. And now, at long last, "the best of" Michael Collins Piper's various writings has been gathered together in one place! This comprehensive collection includes previously unpublished writings, interviews (including the long-lost *Final Judgment* tapes), reviews and insights into the JFK assassination, the Oklahoma City bombing, the Federal Reserve, FDR and Pearl Harbor, Israel's deliberate attack on the *USS Liberty*, Israel and Islamic fundamentalism, the murder of Martin Luther King, the Holocaust and much, much more. Besides the essays by Piper and the Piper interviews, this book also includes synopses of three of Piper's major works—*Final Judgment*, *The High Priests of War* and *The New Jerusalem*. This book is a great way to introduce friends and family members to the world of political intrigue. A fast-reading and informative work that you'll find hard to put down.

Dirty Secrets, softcover, 250 pages, \$22.

Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to a major credit card.



THE JUDAS GOATS: THE ENEMY WITHIN


*The Shocking Never-Before-Told Story
of the Infiltration and Subversion
of the American Nationalist Movement*

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

This amazing work demonstrates how, during the course of the 20th century, paid agents and disruptors, working on behalf of the Zionist cause and for the international interests of the Rothschild banking empire, infiltrated and subverted American nationalist groups. Here is a detailed overview of the intrigues of the infamous Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the corruption of the FBI and the CIA by Zionist elements, the evidence pointing toward Israeli involvement in the Oklahoma City bombing, the strange, little-known story of how Trotskyite elements seized command of the American "conservative" movement and also played a role in manipulating Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy's hunt for communists in high places, a study of the secret powers behind Rupert Murdoch's media empire and much, much more. Guaranteed: You won't be able to put this stunning book down.

The Judas Goats, softcover, 376 pages, \$25 per copy.

Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to a major credit card.



THE HIGH PRIESTS OF WAR

The Secret History of How America's Neo-Conservative Trotskyites Came to Power and Orchestrated the War in Iraq as the First Step in Their Drive for Global Empire

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

The secret history of how America's "neo-conservative" Trotskyites came to power and orchestrated the war against Iraq as the first step in their drive for Global Empire, the so-called New World Order. This was the first-ever book on the role of the "neo-cons" in sparking the debacle in Iraq and remains the only book that tells the entire story—no holds-barred.


The book is now being circulated internationally and has been translated into a variety of languages, acclaimed as the one book that explains the "who, what, when, where, why and how" of the tragic involvement of the United States in the Iraq war.

This fast-paced, carefully-documented 144-page volume has helped spread the word about the REAL reason for the Iraq war and how it is all part of a grand design that is being suppressed by the Controlled Media.

An extensive annotated photo section shows who these neo-cons are and the role they play in the grand scheme to remake the world.

The High Priests of War, softcover, 144 pages, \$20.

Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to a major credit card.



FINAL JUDGMENT

The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

This massive 768-page volume is back from the printer in the second printing of its Sixth Edition, containing explosive new material. Some 50,000 copies of previous editions are in circulation here and around the world, documenting that JFK's obstinate efforts to prevent Israel from building nuclear weapons of mass destruction played a key role in the conspiracy behind JFK's assassination.


Yes, elements of the CIA and organized crime were involved in the JFK conspiracy, but the role of Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, was the long-suppressed "missing link" that was finally unveiled in this titanic work. Includes an extensive photo section and fascinating charts outlining the thesis.

On the strength of this amazing book, Piper has been invited all over the planet to discuss his findings—everywhere from the Arab world to Moscow to Malaysia and Japan. Definitively the last word on the subject, endorsed by former high-ranking Pentagon and State Department officials and countless numbers of independent researchers who aren't afraid to utter the dreaded word . . . Mossad.

GUARANTEED: You'll never look at the JFK assassination—or the events of the last half of the 20th century—in the same way again.

Final Judgment, softcover, 768 pages, 1,000+ footnotes, \$25.

Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to a major credit card.




In the maverick tradition of one of the great historians of the modern era . . .

No topic is "too controversial" for The BARNES REVIEW, the most interesting history magazine published anywhere today. Commemorating the trail-blazing path of the towering 20th Century revisionist historian, the late Harry Elmer Barnes, TBR's mission is to separate historical truth from propaganda and to bring history into accord with the facts.

Founded in 1994 by veteran American nationalist Willis A. Carto—a personal friend of Barnes—*The Barnes Review* concurs with Rousseau's maxim that "falsification of history has done more to impede human development than any one thing known to mankind." TBR covers all aspects of history from the dawn of man to recent events and also places a special focus on the philosophy of nationalism.

As such, TBR proudly describes itself as a "journal of nationalist thought" and dares to be politically incorrect in a day when Cultural Marxism prevails in the mass media, in academia and in day-to-day life. TBR's editorial board of advisors encompasses historians, philosophers and academics from all over the face of the planet, intellectuals united in their desire to bring peace to the world by exposing the lies and prevarications of the past that have brought us to where we are today.

If you believe everything you see in the "responsible" media or think that absolutely everything that appears in most college-level history texts is true, you might be shocked by what you see in TBR—but if you are shocked by what you see in TBR, then that's all the more reason you need to join the growing ranks of independent-minded free-thinkers from all walks of life and all over the world who are longtime TBR subscribers.



Isn't it time you subscribe?

The Barnes Review \$46 for ONE year (six bimonthly issues—64 pages each);

Call 1-877-773-9077 today and charge a subscription to a major credit card.

Send your check, money order or credit card information (including expiration date) to:

The BARNES REVIEW

P.O. Box 15877 • Washington, D.C. 20003

Check us out at www.barnesreview.com

A gutsy newspaper with some big enemies

A no-nonsense independent weekly alternative to the "processed news" of the corporate Media Monopoly.

The one news outlet that dared to publish this book!


American Free Press (AFP) is the maverick national media voice that's been in the forefront reporting the uncensored news that the Controlled Media in America either ignores or suppresses.

You can count on AFP to bring the news that the major media either can not or will not report. Employee-owned-and-operated with no partisan axes to grind, AFP's reporters are committed to the truth, no matter whose ox gets gored.

AFP is the one national newspaper that's dared to tackle the Israeli lobby head on and challenge that clique of neo-conservative warmongers—that well-financed ring of arms dealers, lobbyists and "ex-Trotskyites"—who forced America into the no-win debacle in Iraq. AFP brings its readers the important stories consigned to the Memory Hole by the self-styled "mainstream" media.

Each week—20 pages of uncensored news and information on a wide variety of topics, ranging from civil liberties and the fight against the police state to alternative health and wholistic therapies, taxes and finance, trade and foreign policy. You name it. AFP is on the cutting edge.

Big-name political figures and a host of powerful special interest groups have worked overtime to silence AFP's unswerving journalists whose track record is one that's unmatched by any other independent media voice today. If you have any doubts, why not take a look at AFP for yourself.



Isn't it time you subscribe?

American Free Press: \$59 for ONE year (weekly issues) OR try out a 16-week introductory subscription for only \$17.76.

Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) today and charge a subscription.

Send your check, money order or credit card information (including expiration date) to:

American Free Press

645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE • Suite 100 • Washington, D.C. 20003

Check us out at www.americanfreepress.net

Online subscriptions also available!